00067919

NOT TO BE ISSUED OUT
WITHOUT PERMISSION.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018

# THE STUDY

OF

# THE NEW TESTAMENT.

e 76

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

# AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

# STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

*CRITICAL, EXEGETICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL*

B1678

BY

SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE AND LL.D.

67919

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND IMPROVED.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

A636

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1882.

*All rights reserved.*

2-5
[illegible]
[illegible]


00067919

# PREFACE

TO

# THE SECOND EDITION.

SINCE the first edition appeared, the chief work on Introduction to the New Testament has been Hilgenfeld's 'Einleitung,' the outcome of many books and essays published by that indefatigable scholar. His 'Zeitschrift' also presents valuable critical investigations by the editor himself, Professor Holtzmann, and others, all tending to illustrate the Christian Scriptures.

Mangold supplies useful additions to Bleek's 'Introduction.' Professor Reuss's recent publications on the New Testament are somewhat disappointing, savouring as they do of the Vermittelungs-Theologie, and influenced to some extent by a reactionary spirit towards the Tübingen school. Though this school as represented by Baur and Schwegler has carried its speculations too far, the important advance it has made in the criticism of the New Testament cannot be reversed. Modified it may be; but its mark upon early Christian literature is deep and permanent. In correcting its excesses moderation must be carefully preserved, for examples of backwardism are usually weak. A few faults of the 'Tendenz-Kritik' leave its basis secure.

Most important is the 'Paulinismus' of Pfleiderer, one of the acutest and ablest Germans; while the excellent edition of 'De Wette on the Acts' by Professor Overbeck, is a valuable addition to New Testament criticism.

The German translation of Scholten's treatise on Luke's gospel appeared too late to be used; the first volume of the present work having been already printed off. The view of the synoptics taken by that philosophical scholar differs materially from the one which is given here. His discussion of the fourth gospel is more correct than his opinions about those of Mark and Luke. All that he writes, however, deserves the close attention of Biblical critics.

A few years ago 'Supernatural Religion' was published anonymously, and excited much interest by the outspoken criticism pervading it. The learned work furnishes efficient aid to rational inquiry, and deserves to be studied by all lovers of free investigation. The assaults which were made upon minor details leave its main positions unharmed.

The lives of Christ and St. Paul by Canon Farrar do little to advance the knowledge or criticism of the New Testament but are rather retrograde, by wrapping traditional views in rhetorical verbiage. It is matter of regret that the preacher's fine talents should be used in gilding opinions which scholars have abandoned; or in dismissing the results of sound criticism with an easily-pronounced condemnation.

The 'Speaker's Commentary' takes its stand upon ideas that have passed out of the sphere of established criticism, and furnishes small help to an intelligent

study of the Christian records. If orthodoxy be not still enthroned in high ecclesiastical quarters it looks as if it were, and receives official homage accordingly.

Imperfect, however, as are all English commentaries of recent origin, they may do good, not only by various correct expositions which they cannot avoid giving, but by references to other views and valuable sources. Their appearance shows an increasing attention to the Scriptures. Even in them small concessions to critical results dribble out and will continue to do so till a full stream long fed by rivulets comes in with a force that cannot be resisted. The consummation too startling to be received at once is avoided and averted till the time arrives when it shall be thought no longer perilous to accept the gain. Meanwhile sticklers for the old count their numbers, and are content.

In arranging the contents of the New Testament chronologically great care has been taken to arrive at their true dates. These can only be approached with more or less probability except that of the Revelation, which belongs with certainty to the end of A.D. 68 or beginning of 69. The gospels and post-Pauline literature are attended with most difficulty ; and the inquirer is liable to be perplexed amid the conflicting opinions of critics about them. It is not given to the many to judge aright of internal evidence, which may be pushed unduly to the disparagement of the external.

The present work has been revised throughout, and is much improved in the author's opinion. Few pages appear exactly in their original form ; and many new ones are substituted in place of the old. It is hoped that the changes both in substance and form will make

it worthier of acceptance. A book involving the labour and thought of years is susceptible of continuous improvement. All that a critic can do is to give the processes through which results likely to abide the test of rational research have been reached. The conclusions that bid fair to survive should be the aim of the inquirer. Opinions must not be stereotyped hastily if at all; though it is common enough for men to stick to what is old and popular believing that departure from it is dangerous; as if honest efforts to arrive at truth could be other than innocent.

The author is well aware that a perfunctory conservatism is against the ideas which he has sometimes expressed—that he might quietly follow the example of those who make silence cover a multitude of sins, the violation of conscience among them—and that it is unpalatable to gainsay the religious prepossessions of lay and clerical folk, who will rather turn and rend than lend an ear to the setter forth of unusual sentiments. But higher motives prompt the seeker after truth who cannot hush the voice of the critical faculty within; though abuse awaits him in a time of attachment to antiquated opinions. All he can do is to comfort himself with the thought that he is acting purely.

The writer has tried to investigate again and again the New Testament records as impartially as he can; and trusts he has not knowingly neglected any part of the evidence on which they rest, or underrated their true value. Christianity is an essential factor in the education of the human race, and deserves the most serious attention. Bound up with the eternal welfare of man, it supplies the purest incentives to that higher

life which is begun on earth and perfected in heaven. As the first three centuries witnessed its passage through various phases till it assumed a different aspect from the original one, or even from that in which Paul moulded it, the historian must study these shifting views and bring them out into day. The amalgamation of Petrine and Pauline tenets followed by Johannine ideas led up to a theological system which has dominated succeeding times, with a current of Alexandrian philosophy running through it, leaving the forensic logic and Judaic atonement of Paulinism unchanged. Instead of the church being fitted by a long education to be 'the expositor of the true apostolic doctrine,' it seceded from that doctrine and corrupted its simplicity; so that the fathers of the third and fourth centuries, far from being genuine successors of the apostles in respect of theology, set forth a system inconsistent with theirs. The conflict of more than two centuries made the orthodox church a bad interpreter of apostolic doctrine, so that it is impossible to transfer the immediately ante-Nicene, or the Nicene creed itself in its main features, to the time of Paul, without misreading his own statements. In dealing with the theological diversities of the first two centuries, the author has felt the difficulty of the task.

The need of the age is that rational interpretation of the New Testament which traces the spirit without slavery to the letter; the essence as well as the form; the characteristics of the human instruments through which the divine is revealed; and shows them to the reader in their manifold aspect. But there seems little prospect of this amid the commentaries large and small

that issue from orthodox workshops with an ecclesiastical imprimatur on their front; ruffling the surface of traditional opinion slightly, without satisfying the thoughtful or allaying their doubts. Too often do they and dogmatic systems gloss over the contrarieties and imperfections which are the unavoidable outcome of finite minds in various stages of man's history. Looking only at one of the factors which a divine revelation consists of—the finite and external—they neglect the subjective one which has every difference of degree belonging to the individual soul. And even this procedure is not usually followed; the prudence of silence being a ready antidote to the arguments and conclusions of a liberal theology; since it is easier to take no notice of opinions that disturb inherited belief, than to let in fresh light which may bewilder by its suddenness or frighten by its novelty. If the author has helped in any degree to forward a thorough exposition of the canonical Scriptures, he will not have laboured in vain.

Before concluding, he has to express his best thanks to James Heywood, Esq., F.R.S., whose generous sympathy in all efforts to promote freedom of opinion and religious progress, entitle him to the highest praise. Few have done so much to help on the cause of truth and justice. He has also to acknowledge his obligations to P. H. Lawrence, Esq., Q.C., for disinterested advice and timely aid. The volumes owe more to these friends than can be publicly expressed.

# EXTRACT FROM THE PREFACE

TO

# THE FIRST EDITION.

THE OBJECT of what is called an Introduction to the New Testament is well known. It should discuss all such questions affecting each book, as its age, author, object and aim, credibility, characteristics, integrity, contents. Preparatory to the work of a commentator, it often encroaches on his province. The present writer has admitted into this Introduction more interpretation than is usual in works of the same class, supposing that it will be generally acceptable; and has omitted the critical part of that relating to the Greek text, which he has treated in another work. In discussing each question he has tried to write as clearly as the nature of the subject will admit. Greek and Latin passages, as well as single phrases or words, are transferred to notes wherever it was possible to do so, the corresponding English being given in the text. He has not discussed opinions different from his own, except when their plausibility or the influential names by which they are supported demanded notice. He hopes that intelligent laymen as well as critics will not find the book too scholastic to be studied with facility. The treatment

is as brief as possible, excluding extraneous matter in order to save space and economise the reader's time. Nothing which appeared necessary to completeness is intentionally omitted. If the author's views be not always approved, inquiry will at least be stimulated. They are not put forward lightly, but after anxious thought. Difficult questions, on which the evidence is conflicting, had to be treated, and slender probabilities required to be weighed. In these circumstances the author exercised his best judgment, reaching conclusions cautiously where acute scholars differ. Believing that his opinions will be generally admitted sooner or later, he sends them forth to the world, requesting a candid consideration on the part of the reader. The Bible, however, is a difficult book, and mistakes in explaining it can scarcely be avoided; but impartial thinkers will judge these mistakes leniently.

True critics regret to see that religion is often confounded with a system of theological dogmas. If the two things were clearly distinguished, as they ought to be, a cessation of that bitterness which theologians often show to one another might be reasonably expected. Not that a religion can exist apart from *some* theology. Still the amount of theology needed to constitute a religion may be indefinitely small. If men could see that the Spirit of God neither dwelt exclusively in apostles, nor rendered them infallible however highly gifted they may have been, the sacred records would be less distorted, and different values would be assigned to the several parts of the volume according to their nature. When those records are held to be absolutely correct in all matters, whether historical or speculative, scien-

tific or doctrinal, they acquire a supernatural and fictitious pre-eminence similar to that which is conferred on the pope by the theory of papal infallibility; they are called God's word throughout, which they never claim to be, and thus free inquiry into their credibility is at once checked or suppressed. God's word is in the Scriptures; all Scripture is not the word of God. The writers were inspired in various degrees, and are therefore not all equally trustworthy guides to belief and conduct. In the Bible may be found all things necessary for our salvation; it is an unwarrantable inference that it contains nothing but what is thus needed for all. The Scriptures contain the highest truth; but this fact is undisturbed by the possibility that they may contain some things which are not truth. The author has thus answered by anticipation all the questions which may fairly be addressed to a writer who undertakes to introduce his readers to the study of the New Testament. Anything like a detailed confession of faith or a theological discussion would here be obviously out of place. It is unnecessary for him to draw out the meaning which he attaches to such terms as sacrifice, mediation, inspiration, revelation. If it be a meaning not accepted by certain schools, whether in the Church of England or other religious bodies, it is one for which a large array of great names may be cited, and which is strengthened by the authority of many among the profoundest of Christian thinkers. He would only remind the reader that the inquiry in which he is at present engaged is strictly confined to the ascertainment of facts: and the statements of the New Testament, not less than the subject of an original revelation, must, in

the words of Bishop Butler, be considered 'as a common question of fact.'[1] Hence he candidly acknowledges his conviction that all these statements, whether historical or doctrinal, must be submitted to the ordinary rules of critical inquiry.

In England a free current of religious thought has set in, which needs only to be guided with discretion to produce safe results. Opinions which would have excited bitter hostility not long ago, are now heard with calmness. The reputed authorship of books embraced in the canon is discussed and rejected without the idea that the inquiry is dangerous to the soul. Accredited teachers of religion may canvass the commonly received opinions about the writer of a gospel or epistle, without risking the loss of their position; at least, clergymen of the Church of England may do so, enjoying a freedom favourable to the advancement of rational Christianity, under the protection of the highest civil tribunal. Of this most valuable privilege they are expected to avail themselves.

[1] *Analogy*, Part II. ch. ii. § 2.

# LIST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.


| | VOL. | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| The Gospel of Matthew | I. | 365 |
| The Gospel of Mark | I. | 533 |
| The Gospel of Luke | I. | 424 |
| The Gospel of John | II. | 275 |
| The Acts of the Apostles | II. | 74 |
| The Epistle to the Romans | I. | 101 |
| The First Epistle to the Corinthians | I. | 17 |
| The Second Epistle to the Corinthians | I. | 49 |
| The Epistle to the Galatians | I. | 69 |
| The Epistle to the Ephesians | II. | 195 |
| The Epistle to the Philippians | I. | 156 |
| The Epistle to the Colossians | II. | 170 |
| The First Epistle to the Thessalonians | I. | 4 |
| The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians | I. | 336 |
| The First Epistle to Timothy | II. | 14 |
| The Second Epistle to Timothy | II. | 1 |
| The Epistle to Titus | II. | 8 |
| The Epistle to Philemon | I. | 149 |
| The Epistle to the Hebrews | I. | 177 |
| The General Epistle of James | I. | 304 |
| The First Epistle of Peter | I. | 501 |
| The Second Epistle of Peter | II. | 438 |
| The First Epistle General of John | II. | 231 |
| The Second and Third Epistles of John | II. | 254 |
| The General Epistle of Jude | II. | 264 |
| The Revelation | I. | 240 |

# CONTENTS

OF

# THE FIRST VOLUME.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY . . . . . 1

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS

The Church at Thessalonica and date of the Epistle—Immediate occasion and object—Contents—Authenticity 4

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

Origin of the Church at Corinth—Occasion of the Epistle—Time and place of writing—State of the Church when Paul wrote—The Apostle's visits to the Corinthians before he wrote to them—A lost Epistle addressed to them—Authenticity—Contents . . . . . 17

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

Account of the Apostle between the writing of the First and Second extant Epistles—Effects of the First Epistle on the Church at Corinth—Occasion and Object—Time and place—Unity and integrity—Diction and style—Authenticity—Contents . . . . . 49

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

PAGE

Introduction of Christianity among the Galatians—Time and place at which the Letter was written—The Apostle's adversaries in the Churches—State of the Churches when visited by Paul a second time—Composition of the Galatian Churches—Authenticity—Contents—Relation of the Epistle to the Acts—Interpretation of chap. iv. 21–27; iii. 16 . . . . . 69

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

Origin of the Church—Composition of the Church when Paul wrote—His object or design—Time and place—Authenticity—Integrity—Language—Contents—Paragraphs interpreted, chap. v. 12–19; vii. 7–25 . . 101

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

Person to whom the Letter was addressed—Occasion of it—Time and place—Authenticity—Contents . . . 149

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

Some circumstances connected with Philippi—Authenticity—Unity—Number of Philippian Epistles—Time and place—State of the Church—Occasion and object—Peculiarities in the commencement and conclusion—Contents 156

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Authorship not Pauline—Time and place—Persons addressed—Language—Occasion and object—Contents—Value of the Epistle . . . . . 177

THE REVELATION

Authorship different from that of the fourth Gospel—Time and place—Class of writings it belongs to—The Apostle's object—General structure—Contents—Canonicity and value—Schemes of interpretation—Errors of Expositors 240

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

PAGE

General observations on the collection . . . . . 302

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

The Jameses—Authorship—Persons addressed—Place and time of writing—Authenticity and canonicity—Leading object—Characteristics of the writer and his readers—Language and style—Contents . . . . . 304

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS

Contents—Authenticity—Comparison of the Thessalonian Epistles with the Acts . . . . . 336

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON THE GOSPELS

Their mutual relation . . . . . 352

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Alleged writer—Persons for whom intended—Original language—Apostolicity—Analysis of contents—Characteristics—Leading object—Time of writing—Style and diction—Quotations from the Old Testament . . 365

GOSPEL OF LUKE

The reputed author—Preface—Sources—Relation to the Apostle Paul—Authorship—Analysis of contents—Characteristics—Relation to Marcion's Gospel—Time and place—Sources—For whom written—Language and style—Census of Quirinius—Integrity—Quotations . . 424

FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

Notices of the alleged author—Authenticity—Time and place—Persons addressed—Object—General character, style, and diction—Analysis of contents . . . 501

THE GOSPEL OF MARK

PAGE

The person to whom attributed—Relation of Mark to this Gospel—Analysis of contents—Relation of Mark to Matthew and Luke—Characteristics—Time and place of writing—Integrity—Persons for whom written, and the Evangelist's object—Style and diction—Quotations from the Old Testament . . . . . 533

# INTRODUCTION

TO

# THE NEW TESTAMENT.

## INTRODUCTORY.

BEFORE examining the parts of the New Testament separately, it may not be amiss to notice their general features, especially the nature of their teaching. The apostolic communications are characterised by unity and diversity. The data do not sanction a uniform scheme of dogma for Christ and all His followers, because the incipient theology of the apostolic age was developed in the following centuries with varying ability.

Three moulds of doctrine are presented—the Jewish Christian or Palestinian, the Pauline, and the Alexandrian; their common basis being the character and work of Christ, which are presented in different lights. Absolute unity does not exist. The diversity arises from the writers' different educations and idiosyncrasies, as well as the conflicts of early Christianity. In the texture and tone of the records we see the literary freedom which prevailed till the Gnostic heresy occasioned a selection of Church literature.

The types in question sometimes intermingle, while there are examples of neutrality refusing to be classified. The Pauline mould underwent changes after the apostle's death; so that the post-Pauline epistles exhibit doc-

trines developed out of his by progressive thought or speculative philosophy. The distinctness of the moulds should not be hastily exaggerated into antagonism, though some antagonism must be admitted; and it is equally incorrect to convert *substantial* coincidence into a uniform system of doctrine, though the error has been committed by stiff orthodoxy under the influence of a peculiar theory of inspiration. The types are discernible because they are broad and characteristic, though they may even intersect one another in the same work. Refusing to be crushed into a single dogmatic creed, a due observation of them is essential to the interpretation of the New Testament.

It is necessary to distinguish the teaching of Jesus from the conceptions which the apostles and evangelists had of it. His doctrine was ethical, introduced in the form of Old Testament Messianism refined and purified. As the Messianic idea contained the hope of a universal kingdom, the Founder's conception may have embraced the salvation of the human race. The final commission to baptise and make disciples of all nations throughout the world did not directly proceed from Him; but it is in harmony with the aim of His teaching.

The difficulty of knowing what He meant by *the kingdom of heaven* arises from the ambiguous and fluctuating modes in which it is spoken of. There are passages which favour the opinion that He had the enthusiastic hope of setting up a wondrous kingdom upon earth during the lifetime of that generation, in which virtue and piety, associated with singular happiness, should prevail without interruption after the punishment and subjugation of all evil agencies. But these may be interpreted figuratively, either as representing the victory of the Christian religion or as promises of future reward, though they are too definite to be easily explained in that fashion. Some resort for the solution to Jesus's mental development, which yields an insufficient explanation. Others suppose that He

allowed many sensuous conceptions of His immediate disciples to remain; or rather that He corrected them indirectly and inferentially by sayings which, though seemingly sanctioning carnal views, conveyed a spiritual meaning. Being misunderstood, however, by the disciples, such sayings took the crass shape they have in the synoptists. It is certain that expressions coloured with the Messianic notions of the Jews are attributed to Him which He did not utter. But the extent to which He held by the ancient religion of His nation cannot be known, because of the disconnected, imperfect, and later aspects which the sacred biographers have sometimes given to His discourses. In cases not a few, the reporters misapprehended His meaning. It is therefore unfair to delineate His character from the discourses and sayings indiscriminately which the evangelists put into His mouth. The genuine must be separated from the supposititious—a difficult task, needing reverent discernment. If apostles and evangelists failed to apprehend the real import of His words, remote inquirers may do injustice to Him who spake as never man spake.

The teaching of Jesus took the form of proverb, parable, allegory, symbolical transaction, all directly bearing upon the elevation of humanity. The ultimate object of His doctrine was to put men in a moral relation to God and one another, to purify the mental springs of action,—in a word, to regenerate mankind. The Sermon on the mount, the most authentic summary of what He taught, penetrates to the innermost source of good, recognising a general principle in man which combines faith, love, and moral force, viz., *rightness of heart* before God, or *the single eye* filling the whole body with light. The essential thing in His view involves the ultimate coincidence of religion and morality, a conception which was gradually evolved and not completed till after His death.

# FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

## THE CHURCH AT THESSALONICA AND DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

THESSALONICA, on the site of the ancient Therma, was built at the mouth of the river Echedorus on the Thermaic gulf, and was so named by Cassander in honour of his wife. At the time of the Roman dominion it was large, populous, and wealthy, the metropolis of Macedonia, the seat of a Roman proconsul and quæstor. Many Jews resided there because of its favourable situation for trade.

Paul visited it on his second missionary tour, in company with Silas, perhaps Timothy also, soon after he entered Europe, and found the usual synagogue of the Jews (Acts xvii. 1). Considerable success attended his preaching. It is true that some only of the Jews believed, but a great number of Greek proselytes, and many women of distinction, united themselves to him (xvii. 4). The body of the converts consisted of Gentiles. A large church was gathered, to which few of Jewish extraction belonged, as we infer from 1 Thess. i. 9.

The historian in the Acts speaks of the apostle resorting to the synagogue three Sabbath days, from which some conclude that he stayed at Thessalonica only three weeks. But the idea of a longer abode is favoured by Phil. iv. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 9 : 'For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity. . . . For ye remember, brethren, our labour and

travail: for labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God.' It cannot be that these repeated supplies from Philippi belong to a later visit which Paul made to Thessalonica when he fled from Ephesus (Acts xxi. 1, etc.) as Olshausen supposes. They were sent to him *in the beginning of the gospel, when he departed from Macedonia* (iv. 15); that is, when he published the gospel among the heathen, at the time of his leaving Macedonia; which can only refer to his first visit to Thessalonica. It is likely that the unbelieving Jews drove him away from the synagogue to another place at the end of three weeks, so that he continued a little longer. Yet his stay was short, so that he could not instruct the believers fully in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. De Wette supposes, with great probability, that his preaching took in the main an apocalyptic tendency; that is, it turned on the coming of Christ as a sovereign, the leading ideas incorporated in his teaching being connected with that topic. The political charges of the Jews agree with this. Paul and his associates are accused of acting contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, and setting up another king, one Jesus (Acts xvii. 7). The envy and opposition of the Jews, as well as other circumstances, show that the minds of the Thessalonians had been forcibly impressed with the truth in question.

Compelled to leave Thessalonica, Paul and Silas went to Berœa, whither Thessalonian Jews followed. It would also seem that Timothy, who had remained at Thessalonica, rejoined Paul at Berœa (comp. Acts xvii. 10, 14; 2 Thess. i. 1). After the Jews had caused the apostle to leave Berœa, he was conducted to the sea, and sailed for Athens, accompanied by Timothy, possibly by Silas too. From the capital of Attica, Paul sent Timothy back to Thessalonica, whence he returned to the apostle. Such is the account implied in the first

epistle to the Thessalonians. The statement of the Acts is different, and even contradictory in some particulars. Here Silas and Timothy remained behind when Paul went to Athens, his Bercean escort having orders to send them to him in Athens. The reunion, however, did not take place till the apostle was at Corinth (Acts xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5).

After Paul had despatched his faithful friend to Thessalonica, he departed for Corinth, where he continued a considerable time. During this stay he thought much about the Thessalonians, and had great anxiety on their account; but as soon as Timothy returned from his Macedonian journey with a favourable report, the apostle resolved to write an epistle. Hence the date is about A.D. 53 at Corinth.

### IMMEDIATE OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The account of the church brought by Timothy gave rise to the epistle. The apostle learnt from his messenger that the members had remained steadfast though exposed to persecution, and that their zeal had been an example to many. But some circumstances were less cheering. An enthusiastic expectation of Christ's immediate return led to neglect of their worldly calling as well as to undue depreciation of prophecy. Hence their spiritual parent thought it needful to address a letter to them. The object he had in view was to encourage and admonish; to encourage them in continued steadfastness, and admonish them concerning things they ought to abandon. He confirms and comforts them, enjoining them to act differently in some respects, to be holy, diligent, and humble, walking worthy of their high calling.

### CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into two parts, chaps. i.—iii., and iv., v. The first of these contains the free

utterances of the apostle's heart to the Thessalonian believers respecting their state, his reception among them, his affectionate solicitude on their behalf, and the joy he felt from the good report he had received. The second consists of various admonitions and exhortations relative to their moral condition, administers comfort about the fate of deceased friends at the coming of Christ, warns them to be always ready for that event, and concludes with general counsels.

1. After an introductory salutation, the writer speaks of his continued thanksgiving to God for the faith, love, and hope of the Christians at Thessalonica. He praises them for their prompt reception of the truth, though they were in circumstances of great trial, and speaks of the honour they had in sending forth the gospel into neighbouring countries. They forsook their idolatry so cheerfully as to be an example to others (i. 1—10).

He reminds them of his first appearance at Thessalonica, that he had been anxious solely for their spiritual welfare, supporting himself by the toil of his hands, and burthensome to none ; so that his conduct among them had been characterised by kindness, benevolence, and disinterested affection. He also reminds them of the counsels he had given respecting holiness. After this he praises God again for their willing reception of the gospel, and their steadfast endurance of all the persecutions which had befallen them (ii. 1—16).

The apostle utters his longing to see them again, remarking that he had attempted to return to them several times, but had been hindered. Meanwhile he had sent Timothy to establish and comfort them. By this faithful attendant he had received a pleasing account of their state, which was an unspeakable comfort amid all his discouragements ; and therefore he thanks God, beseeching Him to increase their faith and love (ii. 17—iii. 13).

2. Paul exhorts them to purity of conduct, brotherly

love, and a quiet, orderly pursuit of their daily avocations (iv. 1—12). Coming to eschatology, he instructs them respecting the resurrection of the dead at Christ's reappearance, showing that the deceased should not be deprived of the blessings of Messiah's reign on earth, but be favoured with their Lord's immediate presence simultaneously with the living. As to the time of Christ's coming, he remarks, that it will be sudden, so that they should be always prepared, awake and sober, as children of the day (iv. 13—v. 11).

He counsels them to respect those who presided over them, and to be at peace among themselves; to warn the disorderly, to comfort the feeble in faith, to be patient towards all; to return nothing but good for evil; to be ever contented and happy; to be frequent in prayer and praise; not to repress the spiritual gifts which some of them had received, nor to despise prophesyings as the offspring of enthusiasm, but to prove all the inspirations of the prophets, and retain only what is good. They are to abstain from all sin, and to practise universal righteousness, to which he subjoins the appropriate prayer that God would sanctify them—body, soul, and spirit. In conclusion, he requests their prayers, sends his salutations, and solemnly adjures them to read the letter in public, which is succeeded by the usual benediction (v. 12—28).

## AUTHENTICITY.

Allusions to the epistle in the so-called apostolic fathers are indistinct, though several are given by Lardner and Kirchhofer. In the epistle of Clement of Rome (between 100 and 125) we read: 'We ought in all things to give thanks to Him' (1 Thess. v. 18).[1] 'Let our whole body therefore be saved in Christ Jesus' (1

[1] Ὀφείλομεν καὶ ὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ.—*Ep. ad Corinth.* c. 38.

Thess. v. 23).[1] These references are indistinct. In the epistles to Ignatius we find: 'Devote yourselves to unceasing prayers' (1 Thess. v. 17).[2] 'Pray also for other men without ceasing' (v. 17).[3] The word 'unceasing' is absent from the Syriac in both places. Neither the seven Greek nor the three Syriac epistles can be reckoned authentic, the latter being an extract from the former. All are posterior to Ignatius himself, who was not thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome by command of Trajan; but suffered death at Antioch on December 20, A.D. 115. This rests upon the testimony of John Malalas, which Uhlhorn pronounces worthless.[4] In spite, however, of the ready assertion, it may not be so, even though an earlier testimony and a Syriac menologium seem to disagree, and are therefore paraded in opposition. Harnack admits that there is no certain knowledge about Ignatius having been brought to Rome.[5] He goes still farther in asserting that the tradition respecting the martyrdom under Trajan is improbable, bringing the epistles into the time of Hadrian or Atoninus Pius, but still preserving their authenticity with some hesitation. If he has succeeded in showing the insecurity of the common tradition, the authenticity of the epistles cannot be defended in the face of strong internal grounds against it. Zahn has failed to prove that the letters proceeded from Ignatius; and Uhlhorn adds nothing of importance to his arguments. The letters were written after A.D. 150.

Polycarp writes: 'Making intercession for all without ceasing' (v. 17);[6] 'Abstaining from all iniquity' (v. 22).[7]

[1] Σωζέσθω οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.—*Ibid.*

[2] Προσευχαῖς σχόλαζε ἀδιαλείπτοις.—*Ad Polycarp.* i.

[3] Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε.—*Ad Ephes.* c. 10.

[4] In Herzog's Real-Encyklopædie, vol. vi. p. 692, new edition.

[5] *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, p. 67.

[6] Ἐντυγχανούσας ἀδιαλείπτως περὶ πάντων.—*Ad Philipp.* c. 4.

[7] Ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ἀδικίας.—*Ibid.* c. 2.

The authenticity is clearly attested by Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria.

Irenæus writes: 'And on this account the apostle, explaining his own meaning, has set forth the perfect and spiritual man of salvation, speaking thus in the first epistle to the Thessalonians: "And may the God of peace sanctify you wholly, and your entire spirit, soul, and body be kept without complaint till the advent of the Lord Jesus Christ"' (v. 23).[1]

Tertullian says: 'And therefore the majesty of the Holy Spirit, which discerns such senses, suggests in the epistle to the Thessalonians itself: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you; for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night,"' &c. (v. 1, &c.)[2]

Clement of Alexandria writes: 'This the blessed Paul plainly signified, saying: "When we might have been burdensome as apostles of Christ, we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children"' (ii. 7).[3]

The epistle was in Marcion's canon. It is also in the old Latin and Syriac versions, as well as the Muratorian fragment.

The chief opponent of the epistle's authenticity is Baur, whose arguments are marked by his usual acuteness, and are in substance the following.

[1] 'Et propter hoc apostolus seipsum exponens, explanavit perfectum et spiritualem salutis hominem, in prima epistola ad Thessalonicenses dicens sic: Deus autem pacis sanctificet vos perfectos, et integer vester spiritus et anima et corpus sine querela in adventum Domini Jesu Christi servetur.' —*Adv. Hæres.* v. 6, i.

[2] 'Et ideo majestas Spiritus Sancti perspicax ejusmodi sensuum et in ipsa ad Thessalonicenses epistola suggerit: De temporibus autem et temporum spatiis, fratres, non est necessitas scribendi vobis. Ipsi enim certissime scitis, quod dies Domini, quasi fur nocte, ita adveniet,' etc.—*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 24.

[3] *Τοῦτό τοι σαφέστατα ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ὑπεσημήνατο, εἰπών· δυνάμενοι ἐν βαρεῖ εἶναι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα.*—*Pædagog.* i. p. 88 (ed. Sylburg).

1. Among all the Pauline letters, none is so far behind the rest in the nature and importance of its contents. Not a single doctrinal idea is prominently adduced except that in iv. 13—18. The contents consist of general instructions, admonitions, wishes, such as are merely subordinate and secondary in the Pauline epistles. The unimportant nature of the materials, the absence of special interests and of a reasonable motive for writing, testify an un-Pauline origin.

If the contents of the epistle correspond to the known circumstances and wants of the church at Thessalonica, provided they do not contradict ascertained Pauline characteristics, the critic should be satisfied. Should the didactic and doctrinal element be overpowered by the hortatory, may not the relations between Paul and the church account for it? We should look to historical circumstances for the origin and character of the letter, not to abstract considerations of Christian doctrine. Expectation of Christ's immediate advent seems to have had a great effect on the church. Laying hold of their minds, it gave rise to various related questions, which furnished one reason at least for the apostle's writing. The topic does not indeed form the body of the letter, but it is no unimportant part of it. The apostle himself expected the speedy advent of Christ, as we learn from 1 Cor. xv. He had preached it to this Gentile community, and it had produced a great effect upon them. The state of the converts in relation to it was one cause of his writing; and some of the general admonitions were prompted by the influence which the belief had upon their daily life. If the doctrinal element in the epistle recedes behind the practical, and if the latter takes the form of general exhortations, the departure from Paul's accustomed mode can only be attributed to the circumstances of the case. All the churches which the apostle planted, or wrote epistles to, were not alike. If they

were not, why should his letters be cast in a uniform mould? It may therefore be granted that the epistle is meagre compared with those addressed to the Romans or Galatians, without detriment to its authenticity. Can we expect the apostle to write such epistles as the Galatian and Roman ones to all other churches?

2. The chief contents of the letter are nothing but an enlarged explanation of the circumstances attending the conversion of the Thessalonians, which they themselves already knew, and which we know from the Acts of the Apostles. The author of the letter may either have drawn his materials direct from that book, or from another source. Thus, i. 4, etc., only tells how the apostle preached the gospel to them, and how they received it. In ii. 1 there is a more definite allusion to the circumstances in which the apostle had visited Thessalonica, and the way he had laboured among them; iii. 1 relates what had taken place shortly before, which the Thessalonians already knew. There is throughout a reference to things with which the readers were familiar, as the author himself shows by the recurring verb *know* (i. 4; ii. 1, 2, 9, 11; iii. 3, 4; iv. 2).

It should be recollected that the history of the conversion of the Thessalonians is only a part of the letter, not the substance of it; that the writer's references to that event were meant to strengthen them in the faith; that the appeal to what they knew already comes from one filled with the remembrance of his presence among them; that the agreement of the account of their conversion with that in the Acts is an argument *for* rather than *against* the Pauline authorship, especially as it is not literal, as though it originated in independent authorship.

According to Hilgenfeld, iii. 1—6 is even out of harmony with Acts xvii.: how then can the latter be the source of the former? Should harmony and discordance form an equal argument against authenticity?

3. The passage ii. 14—16 is said by Baur to have an un-Pauline stamp. The language about the Jews is certainly stronger than that of the apostle elsewhere, and breathes a different spirit from the epistle to the Romans. Hatred of the human race is attributed to them. Does not his description of them suit their actual relation toward all who were not of their race? They hindered the salvation of the Gentiles; and the writer had just been treated most severely by his countrymen in Thessalonica and Berœa. They are denounced with a bitter indignation which may only have been momentary. But do not the words, 'wrath has come upon them to the uttermost,' show that in the political state of the Jews at that time the apostle clearly foresaw their future ruin? From the process which had begun he divined their total destruction. The phraseology, 'to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved,' at which Baur stumbles, un-Pauline as he says it is and borrowed from the Acts (xiv. 1; xvi. 6, 32; xviii. 9), is nearly analogous to 2 Cor. ii. 17. The passage agrees confessedly with the Acts of the Apostles, from which source—a source partly unhistorical according to the critic in the place that supplies material for the present—it is alleged to be taken. But it is far from clear that the Acts furnished it.

4. The epistle contains plain reminiscences of other Pauline ones, especially of those to the Corinthians. In proof of this the critic gives i. 5 from 1 Cor. ii. 4; i. 6, from 1 Cor. xi. 1; ii. 4, etc., from 1 Cor. ii. 4, iv. 3, etc., ix. 15, etc., especially 2 Cor. ii. 17, v. 11. The expression *covetousness*, ii. 5, points to 2 Cor. vii. 2; *might have been burdensome*, ii. 6, *would not be chargeable*, ii. 9, point to 2 Cor. xi. 9; and ii. 7 to 1 Cor. iii. 2. In i. 8 the phrase *in every place your faith is spread abroad* resembles Rom. i. 8.

These similarities of thought and expression are too slender to show the dependence of one writer upon

another. The circumstances of the Corinthian and Thessalonian churches were not very dissimilar ; and the same author might employ the same thoughts and words in different epistles. The analogies are not marked enough to betray the hand of a copyist, and might be paralleled by similar ones in the epistles to the Galatians and Romans.[1]

5. How can it be said of a newly-founded church that they were patterns to all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia ; that the report of their having received the word of the Lord had gone forth to every place, so that people could relate of them that they had turned from idolatry to the true God (i. 7, etc.)? How could the apostle say, after so short a period, that he had the most earnest longing to see them personally again (ii. 17 ; iii. 10)? How could the brotherly love of the Thessalonians, manifest to all the brethren in all Macedonia, be celebrated as a general virtue (iv. 9)? Were exhortations to a quiet life of labour, such as are given in iv. 11, 12, so necessary there ? These questions are asked by Baur.

The answer to them depends on the right interpretation of the passages, and the assumption of a date not too soon after the church was founded. They are compatible with a year's interval.

6. The passage in iv. 14—18 respecting the resurrection of the dead, and the relation of the dead and living to the appearing of Christ, is pronounced un-Pauline by Baur ; who admits, however, that it coincides with 1 Cor. xv. 52, though going far beyond it ; and that it could not be urged with effect if the authenticity of the epistle were better established.

The Corinthian passage and the present explain and supplement one another. It was only in the beginning of Christianity, and in an individual church, that the

[1] See Jowett *On the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Romans, Galatians*, etc., vol. i. p. 23, *et seq.*

destiny of the believers who died before the second advent could disturb the minds of surviving friends, as it did at Thessalonica.[1]

In opposition to the objections against authenticity, the internal evidence that the epistle is St. Paul's is very strong, as stated by Jowett with masterly ability.

Too much importance is attached by Baur to uniformity of ideas and expressions as evidence of Pauline authorship. He takes four epistles unquestionably authentic and forming a group by themselves, as the standard of measurement for groups of later and earlier origin. By this means little room is allowed for growth in the apostle's mind; nor is there latitude for the influence of that wide variety of circumstances through which he passed, of the persevering opponents he had to encounter, or of the local diversities of peoples. Probably an expression of his own throws some light on the character of his preaching at different times. 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more' (2 Cor. v. 16). At one time he had carnal views of Christ. He expected his personal advent as near. So he preached to the Thessalonians, who had been much agitated by the expected event. That belief necessarily involved sensuous ideas respecting the nature of his kingdom, which was to be in some sort an earthly one. Further reflection aided by experience, led the apostle to more spiritual conceptions of Christ and his kingdom. For such development on the part of the apostle, Baur does not allow sufficient room. Yet nothing is more probable. The man who did so much to separate Christianity from the old religion and bring out its universal aspect—who, finding it a spiritual offshoot of Judaism, raised it up into an absolute religion divested of Jewish swaddling-clothes, was surely a many-sided thinker, whose ideas enlarged with time, becoming purer

[1] See Baur's *Paulus*, p. 480, etc.

and higher. Believing so, we are prepared to find in his earliest epistles other ideas and expressions than in his later—less profound, less refined, not impregnated with the distinctive doctrines evolved out of his contest with Judaising Christians, but more elementary, and with a form less systematic.

The first epistle to the Thessalonians cannot be compared with the four subsequent and larger ones, in richness of thought or importance of contents. In it Paul does not appear on the elevated platform of his apostolic consciousness, which his struggle with Christian Judaism encroaching on the territory he had won over to the truth, called forth. The ideas expressed by *righteousness*, *justification*, *justify*, the opposition of faith and works, the efficacy of Christ's death, reconciliation to God through the Mediator, and kindred doctrines which are the distinguishing features of his preaching, are absent. He speaks of one topic, the return of Christ, an event on which the hopes of Christians in the apostolic time were centred. Round this animating subject the interest of the Thessalonians had gathered. All the amiability of the apostle's nature for a young church which needed the counsels of their spiritual father amid enthusiastic expectations and severe persecution, presents itself to the reader in an attractive light. He speaks against Jews as the great enemies of himself and the Thessalonians, not Judaising Christians as afterwards, and foresees their utter destruction. The cross of Christ had not yet filled his soul, in opposition to works of law or deeds wrought in human strength; nor did the necessity of Christian emancipation from all Judaism stand out before him in its distinct reality. The progress of events developed these conceptions in full force; they lay as yet in the background of his mind, waiting evolution.

# FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

## ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT CORINTH.

CORINTH was situated on an isthmus between the Ægean and Ionian seas. It was the capital of Achaia, noted for the Isthmian games celebrated in its neighbourhood, and for its arts, wealth, and luxury. Cicero styles it *the light of Greece.* About the year 146 B.C. it was destroyed by Mummius the Roman general. But Julius Cæsar had it rebuilt, and peopled with colonists. Its favourable situation soon secured a flourishing commerce. The city rapidly regained its former splendour, in connection with former licentiousness. The gross worship of Venus, who had a renowned temple in the place, furnished with a thousand impure priestesses, presents melancholy evidence of debasement; notwithstanding the schools of philosophy on which, to use the words of Aristides the rhetorician, one stumbled at every step. Hence Dion Chrysostom terms it a city, 'the most licentious of all that are or have been.'[1]

This city, the meeting-place of eastern and western commerce, was selected by Paul as the scene of his labours for a considerable period. The number and character of the inhabitants, added to the importance of the situation and the influx of strangers, made it desirable that Christanity should obtain a firm hold there. No station was more favourable to the diffusion of the new religion through the Roman empire. The apostle chose it as his sphere for eighteen months. Here he

[1] *Corinthiaca Oratio*, xxxvii. p. 119, vol. ii. Ed. Reiske.

worked, in company with several associates, amid the opulence, luxury, vice, and learning of the idolatrous inhabitants. As usual, he encountered opposition from the Jews who had settled in it for the purposes of traffic. Yet even among them some leading persons believed, as Crispus and Sosthenes; though the church consisted of Gentiles, chiefly belonging to the poorer class, not many of whom were wise, noble, or mighty.

The apostle visited the city on his second missionary journey, after he left Athens. Here he found Aquila and his wife, who had lately arrived from Italy in consequence of Claudius's decree against the Jews in Rome. Taking up his abode in the house of Aquila, he wrought at the same manual employment. Whether Aquila was a convert to Christianity before he came to Corinth, is not certain; the expression, 'a certain Jew' (Acts xviii. 2) being indefinite, and marking perhaps the nation to which he belonged. If he were a believer in Christianity, his knowledge was imperfect, needing the enlargement and correction which the apostle would supply.

It is related in the Acts, according to the manner of the book, that Paul addressed himself first to the Jews at Corinth, preaching Christ in their synagogue on the Sabbath day. After Timothy and Silas arrived from Macedonia he became bolder, and testified more plainly that Jesus was the Messiah. This gave great offence to the unbelievers, who contradicted and blasphemed. He therefore turned to the Gentiles, and succeeded so well in leading them from error, that the Jews seized and dragged him before Gallio the Roman proconsul, accusing him of opposition to the law of Moses. But the humane governor refused to interfere in ecclesiastical matters. After this insurrection, the historian states that the apostle remained a good many days, then sailed to Syria with Aquila and Priscilla, leaving perhaps his faithful assistants, Timothy and Silas, in Corinth.

## OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

Soon after Paul's arrival at Ephesus a second time, from Galatia, he heard of various irregularities in the conduct of the converts at Corinth, and wrote an epistle, now lost, warning them against corrupt practices.

During his abode in Ephesus, he had opportunities of hearing particulars about the state of the church he had left, and the reports were still unfavourable. Some members of Chloe's household, perhaps Apollos too, who seems to have removed from Corinth to Ephesus while the apostle abode in the latter place, gave him information respecting the distractions of the community. These representations led to the resolution of taking a journey through Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem, preparatory to which he had sent Timothy and Erastus into those parts, to forward the collection for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem, and to rectify the irregularities of the Corinthian church. Meanwhile messengers arrived, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, bringing a letter concerning various things, and asking different questions. By this means, he became acquainted with the contentions and disorders of the church, and was induced to write our first epistle, which was dictated perhaps to Sosthenes, and sent by the three messengers of the church. It was Paul's wish that Apollos should accompany the bearers, and use his endeavour to heal the distractions which had arisen but he refused to go. Timothy had been despatched before the epistle was written. Had he been with the apostle, he would probably have been specified in the salutation at the commencement.

## TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The letter was written, as we have seen, from Ephesus, when Paul was there the second time, towards

the close of his visit, and not long before Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), A.D. 57. The subscription states that it was written from Philippi, the origin of which may be traced to an erroneous explanation of the words in xvi. 5, 'for I do pass through Macedonia,' which express no more than his determination to pass through it. MS. B., but a reviser not the first hand, has the correct statement *Ephesus* in the subscription.

Many have discovered an allusion to the time of year in which the epistle was written, in the words, 'know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover was sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (v. 6—8). The metaphorical expressions in this passage are supposed to have been suggested by the near approach of the passover, when leaven was prohibited among the Jews. The apostle commences with a proverbial expression, meaning that as the smallest taint of sin had a tendency to spread through the mass, the Corinthian Christians should put away the old leaven of sin, that they might be holy; for Christ the true passover lamb had been offered for them. It is probable that the passage *was* suggested by the near approach of the Jewish passover, though it may be explained without the allusion. This fixes the time of writing in the spring of A.D. 57.

### STATE OF THE CHURCH WHEN PAUL WROTE.

A community of believers gathered from among the inhabitants of Corinth must have presented phenomena demanding special attention. Surrounded by prevailing immorality, it was difficult for them to realise the purity which Christianity requires. The piety of the believers

was less steady and consistent than it would have been, had their state before conversion been different. Their depraved nature continued to exert considerable power over their conduct; and they were in great danger of relapsing into former practices. Christianity does not deliver the spirit at once from sinful excesses. It lays the axe to the root of the tree; but repeated strokes are necessary to kill the luxuriant growth. Regeneration is not like a sudden or magic spell; it is rather a process; for grace operates in accordance with the laws of our moral nature. The divine life is progressive and varied. We need not wonder, therefore, that the church at Corinth exhibited various disorders after Paul's departure. Some, unable to resist temptations, relapsed into old excesses; one had taken his stepmother to wife; and the majority exhibited a spirit of dissension arising out of individual preferences. Spiritual gifts were abused. The members were puffed up one against another. In the midst of these disagreeable things, the church wrote to their founder, informing him of their state, and asking his opinion on several points. He had heard from other quarters of their improprieties; and we may imagine his deep solicitude.

The greater part of the converts were Gentile Christians, as might have been expected and as the notices in the Acts respecting the ministry of Paul attest. The contents of the letters themselves show a predominant heathen element. But there were not wanting members that had come out of Judaism, or had imbibed Jewish ideas and prejudices, so that the apostle gave admonitions to Jewish and Gentile Christians in their mutual relations, as he does to other churches. The Cephas party mentioned in i. 12, proves that Jewish Christians were present in the Church. It is true that the Judaising opponents of the apostle present a different aspect from the usual one. Their antagonism to Pauline Christianity did not proceed from the purely

Jewish standpoint of circumcision. It had advanced to a more Christian stage, through tact or religious development ; through the felt necessity of accommodation to the circumstances of a Greek people, whose prejudices might be more easily disarmed by a less Jewish type of opposition. The central point of attack was apostolic authority. This smoother form of Jewish opposition was more likely to find favour in a Greek-Christian Church, than the coarser and narrower type that culminated in circumcision.

1. With respect to parties in the church, it is impossible to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. It is clear that there were classes who assumed the names of different leaders ; but it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain their characteristic features, since the epistles themselves indicate little more than their existence. There is therefore a strong temptation to construct hypotheses respecting them out of imaginary or slender materials. Yet probable conjecture must be summoned to aid the enquiry. Hints in the epistles, historical circumstances, scattered statements, must be combined, to yield some light on the subject.

The only passage in which the parties are clearly mentioned is 1 Cor. i. 12 : 'Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul ; and I of Apollos ; and I of Cephas ; and I of Christ.' Other places supposed to indicate them are less definite.

The first question that occurs is, How many parties are specified here ? Some answer three, supposing that the Christ party consisted of neutrals, who ranged themselves under no human head, but took Christ alone for their master ; simple-minded Christians, who remained steadfastly attached to Christ's teaching. Although this view is as old as Chrysostom, and claims support from 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23, where it is thought that the four parties are alluded to and that of Christ alone commended, it is really baseless. The words 'and ye are

Christ's ' allude to all the members ; and the additional clause ' Christ is God's ' seems designedly to exclude any commendation of the Christ party. The phrase *Christ Himself is subject to God* cuts off the very basis of their pretensions ; not that the basis was wrong in idea, but because it was applied in a schismatical spirit. The context of i. 12 is adverse to the hypothesis, for the thirteenth verse speaks of the first three with disapproval, and since the Christ party is classed along with them, it is involved in the general censure. The form of the expression ' Is Christ divided,' probably derived from ' and I of Christ,' leads to the inference that they as well as the rest were exposed to the charge of rending Christ's spiritual body.

Others answer that there were but two parties, properly speaking, in the Church, the Pauline and the Petrine. As the Pauline and Apollos Christians were substantially one, because both must have been Gentiles holding the same doctrines which Paul and Apollos preached ; it is thought that the Petrine and Christ party were substantially the same, both Jewish Christians but taking different names. This hypothesis may be called that of Baur, for though taken from Schmidt it received freshness from his ingenious illustration. The Christ party, as he supposes, were Jewish Christians, whose object was to undermine Paul's apostolic authority, and to engraft Judaism on Christianity. They called themselves after Cephas, the chief of the apostles. And to show that they were intimately connected with Christ through their teachers, they assumed the appellation ' of Christ,' indicating that they followed Christ's genuine apostles. They therefore cast indirect reproach on Paul, as not a true apostle ; and distinguished themselves from others as if they alone were true Christians. The state of the community they belonged to may have caused the Judaisers to keep their legal notions in the

background, and to insist on that aspect of them which detracted from Paul's authority.[1]

Various allusions in the epistle countenance this view. Thus the apostle writes in 2 Cor. x. 7: 'If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.' Here Paul defends his apostleship against opponents or Judaisers, who seem to have claimed a relation to Christ which he had not.

The objections advanced against this hypothesis by Neander and others can neither be refuted nor made good, because the epistles contain little knowledge on the subject. The objection that *Christ* was the assumed head, not a *human* leader, which the other three parties claimed, is nugatory. It has been asked, What was the use of the two appellations? Was not one sufficient? We are inclined to believe, that the Petrine and Christ party were subdivisions of one and the same class. Hilgenfeld supposes the difference between them to be in the fact that the Christ party were direct disciples of Christ, while the Petrines were merely disciples of the apostles; and believes that he has removed the one weakness of the Baurian hypothesis in such fashion. By adding the genuine school of Christ to that of the first apostles, he gets at the two divisions of Jewish Christians who depreciated Paul.

It is needless to discuss the view of Olshausen and Guericke, that the Christ party consisted of philosophical Christians or wisdom-seeking Greeks, who constructed for themselves a peculiar form of Christian doctrine modelled according to Greek ideas. Having a written gospel of their own, they rejected all apostolic traditions. In short, they were Gnostics, who saw no more than a higher Socrates in the Redeemer. The depreciation of human wisdom in the epistle is directed against them. The number of philosophic Christians

[1] *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, pp. 261–332.

in the church must have been very small. There is no ground for assuming that the gospel had attracted the cultivated heathen at Corinth. As preached by the apostle there, it must have repelled the persons who boasted of their wisdom. Nor is it necessary to enter into Schenkel's view, which makes the distinguishing peculiarity of the party *theosophic mysticism*. They appealed, it is thought, to an inward revelation, as Paul appealed to immediate revelations of Christ, and so, placing themselves on the same level, assailed his apostolic authority.[1] Rejecting apostolic tradition, and entering into communication with Christ by visions, they ascribed inspiration to themselves. The passages 1 Cor. ix. 1 ; 2 Cor. x. 7, xii. 1, etc., are supposed to find their explanation in this theosophic view. Though the hypothesis is adopted by De Wette, it is improbable. As to Ewald's notion of their being Christian Essenes who exalted Christ's celibacy into a rule of life, little can be said in its favour. Rückert, Meyer, and Hofmann consider the party to have been orthodox, a hypothesis afterwards adopted by Neander. The enlargement of the parties from two to three gave rise to an earnest desire for union ; and therefore a fourth tendency originated, which assumed independence of all human authority, and set itself above the rest. The name of Christ was used to cover and commend it. Though this view has much plausibility, and agrees well with the supposition that the four parties are mentioned in the order of their origination (1 Cor. i. 12), it is liable to objection. Indeed, it is easy to state difficulties in the way of any hypothesis that may be advanced.

Referring the reader to Baur's masterly survey of the leading hypotheses respecting the Christ party we remark, that the sections may not have been distinctly marked. Perhaps they were not well-defined, with lines of doctrine dividing them the one from the other.

[1] *De Ecclesia Corinthi primæva factionibus turbata.* Basiliæ, 1838.

That they were distinguished in some way from each other, even in a doctrinal view, must be allowed ; but theological peculiarities were only one element in their discords. We cannot tell how far personal attachments and antipathies may have influenced them.

The first idea occurring to the reader, is that the Christ party consisted of Jewish Christians. Those of Paul and Apollos were substantially one, and the last two should be regarded in the same light. By this means symmetry is introduced into the enumeration. But Rückert affirms, that a logical division of the members was not in the apostle's mind.[1] How does he know ? Both epistles show that opponents in the church questioned Paul's apostleship, and therefore he vindicates his claims. The Jewish Christians or Petrines did so ; and 2 Cor. x. 7 leads to the conclusion that the Christ party did the same. Nothing tangible favours the belief that the latter were theosophic Christians or spiritualising Gnostics who exalted human wisdom and laid claim to a deeper knowledge which specially united them to Christ ; that they inclined to merge the historical in the ideal Christ, and resolved Christianity into a spiritual essence. Such speculative or theosophic subjectivity could not have emerged among the members of the Corinthian church, who belonged to the humbler and poorer class.

It is natural to suppose that the Corinthians who had been converted by Paul were most attached to *his* person, and believed in his apostolic authority. On the other hand, such as had been moved by Apollos, looked up to him with reverence. But Paul and Apollos preached the same truth, and their respective adherents did not differ in doctrinal opinions. Apollos was the more eloquent ; Paul the more learned at least in Jewish literature. The former was an Alexandrian Jew, tinged with the mode of interpretation applied to the Scriptures

[1] *Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther u. s. w.* I. Beilage, p. 436.

by the cultivated Jews of Egypt. This would naturally influence the manner in which he expounded Christianity, and suit the taste of Corinthians accustomed to Greek culture. He had also the advantage of succeeding the apostle; and people usually prefer the last speaker. From the twelfth verse of the first chapter to the end of the fourth, the apostle refers to the Pauline and Apollos-Christians; *the wisdom of the world*, contrasted with *the wisdom of God*, pointing to the latter. The indirect polemics of the first four chapters, directed against the Apollos adherents, lead to the supposition that their head set forth the doctrines of Christianity in a theosophic, Alexandrian mould, or in a scientific form which challenged the attention of the cultivated. In his hands the new religion approached the wisdom propounded in schools of philosophy under the garb of artificial rhetoric. In proportion to the stress which the Apollos party laid upon *science*, the contrast between them and the Paulines would appear greater; for the apostle had determined to know nothing among the Corinthians but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. His gospel was so simple that it seemed to indicate a deficiency of culture; whereas he had refrained on purpose from the attractive language of human wisdom. The Christ preached by Paul and Apollos was the same; but the doctrine of the cross took a different form in their hands.

The Cephas party consisted of Jewish Christians who did not refuse to associate with Gentile believers, and were therefore of a milder type than many of their brethren. Overstepping the exact boundary between Jewish and Gentile Christians, they still denied Paul's apostleship. Their great stumbling block was the death of Messiah on the cross, to which the apostle attached paramount importance; for they connected Messiahship with Jesus's life and work rather than his death.

The Christ party are mentioned but once in the first

epistle, perhaps because they had not then appeared openly against Paul, as they soon did. They are referred to in the second epistle from the tenth to the twelfth chapters inclusive; and all our knowledge of them must be drawn thence. They were adventitious brethren who had come from Jerusalem and speedily developed into decided opponents of Paul; strict Judaisers, who vaunted their intimate connection with Christ. They are called apostles of Christ (2 Cor. xi. 13), overmuch apostles (xi. 5, xii. 11), ministers of Christ (xi. 23), false apostles (xi. 13). These men attacked the apostle not only on the ground of his putting the essence of Christ's Messianic efficacy in the death on the cross, but also on the ground of his not belonging to the twelve, as he had not seen the Lord nor come into personal contact with Him. Against such presumptuous opponents, Paul asserts his official position in the strongest manner. Though they had come from Jerusalem with the sanction of James, and bearing letters of commendation, they had to be withstood much more than the Cephas party because they were rigider Judaisers. Paul charged them with preaching a different gospel from his. At Jerusalem, James headed the extreme Jewish Christians, to whom Peter seemed too pliable. Whether they were a party within the church at Corinth like the rest, or rather a party by the side of the others, is not clear. They were, in a sense, foreign to Corinth; and formed perhaps no integral portion of the community there.[1]

Some have doubted whether the parties in the church were distinguished from one another by doctrinal opinions, both because there is no necessary connection between the existence of schisms and diversities of sentiments, and because the apostle condemns the schisms without reference to doctrinal errors. But

[1] See Holsten's *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Teil 1, p. 191, etc. The recent literature on the party is given by this writer in a note.

though the Corinthians disputed about the comparative excellence of their teachers, the Petrine differed from the Pauline Christians in doctrinal views. Why the apostle refrains from assigning the errors he condemns, to the respective parties, cannot be discovered. Perhaps those errors could not be definitely distributed, but floated more or less among all—a circumstance which suggests caution to the interpreter, lest he attempt to do what the writer himself has avoided. But we may arrive at probable conclusions respecting the inclination of the several parties to erroneous sentiments or practices noticed in the epistle. The spirit of the church was sensuous. Its standard of purity was low ; its members of a heterogeneous sort. Those who divide all professing Christians into regenerate and unregenerate, or who hold that a proper church should consist of the former alone, are discountenanced by the dubious character of the Corinthian believers, many of whom were as far from modern orthodoxy as from sanctity of life. The church was disorderly and unspiritual, its elements consisting of voluptuous Greeks of the lower class, with a minority of cultivated minds to which the new religion offered few attractions. When Christianity came into contact with the Greek mind, it had to make its way slowly through modes of thought alien to its genius, which were seconded, only too strongly, by a loose morality. Idealism and sensuousness presented an uncongenial front to the doctrine that true life comes only through faith in a crucified Messiah.

In addition to the contentions of parties, other disorders existed.

2. Some had fallen into sins of uncleanness. That lewdness had become pretty general may be inferred from the words, 'It is reported commonly among you that there is fornication' (v. 1), where the adverb 'commonly'[1] refers to the whole clause, intimating that

[1] ὅλως.

varieties of uncleanness, included in the generic term 'fornication,' existed amongst the Corinthians. The writer then proceeds to notice an extreme case of impurity, viz., unnatural intercourse between a stepson and stepmother. Whether the case was one of marriage or concubinage is unimportant. The verb 'to have'[1] is commonly applied to the former; and that idea agrees best with v. 2, 3. Notwithstanding the scandalous nature of the act, the members of the church had not withdrawn from the society of the incestuous. The man may have pleaded the privilege of proselytes to Judaism—that conversion abolished degrees of relationship. The woman was probably a heathen. The apostle enjoins immediate exclusion from the church, and takes occasion to speak of other vices—covetousness, idolatry, railing, drunkenness, extortion, which should be dealt with in the same manner. He exhorts his readers to have no intercourse with fornicators or persons guilty of notorious vices, but to disavow their deeds, lest sin should be countenanced in the eyes of the heathen.

3. In their observance of the Lord's Supper, various abuses had crept into the practices of the Corinthian Christians. This feast consisted of two parts—a preparatory meal or *love feast* preceding *the supper* properly so called. To this love feast each brought meat and drink, of which all partook on an equal footing. The poor man shared the bounty of the rich, as if he had contributed his part of the meal; and the brethren, rich and poor, masters and slaves, exhibited a spectacle of unity to the world. But when Christian love cooled, the love feasts lost their true character. Those who brought food with them ate and drank by themselves, apart from the members whom poverty prevented from contributing. The poor, in their hunger, were compelled to look on; while the rich brethren, having more than was necessary, indulged in excess. One was hungry

[1] ἔχειν.

and another was drunken. The meal degenerated into a private feast, and lost its proper significance. By such conduct the rich unfitted themselves for joining in the essential part of the transaction with spiritual discernment. From whatever source the Gentile Christians borrowed their love feasts, such meals do not seem to have prevailed in the apostolic churches generally. The apostle did not forbid them, as some suppose, but wrote against their abuse. They are condemned as far as they ceased to promote Christian love, that is, as far as their original purpose was lost sight of.

4. Another impropriety committed by the Corinthian Christians consisted in appeals to heathen tribunals, showing that a generous confidence in the integrity of the brethren had given place to selfishness. It was customary for the Jews to decide disputes before tribunals of their own, a practice supposed to be based on Exodus xxi. 1,[1] and transferred perhaps from the synagogue to the Christian church. To correct these unseemly disputes before civil magistrates, the apostle reasons with the Corinthians thus: 'If the saints are to judge the world and angels themselves, they are much more competent to decide the minor affairs of the present state.' Legal disputes before heathens are censured as contrary to Christian love.

5. Some of the believers doubted or denied the truth of the resurrection. These doubts sprang up in heathen soil. Gentile Christians belonging to the church entertained them, basing their objections on the current doctrine of the resurrection which was opposed to Greek and Roman ideas. Men who had renounced the vulgar ideas about Elysium and Tartarus revolted from the teaching of the gospel concerning future existence, because it involved a return of the body to life upon the earth, a doctrine which arose in the bosom of later

[1] 'These are the judgments which thou shalt set before them' (the Jews, not the Gentiles).

Judaism, and was transferred to primitive Christianity.[1] Whether such scepticism arose from a philosophic tendency, or was fostered by the prevailing sensuousness at Corinth, cannot be ascertained. In opposing it the apostle does not distinguish between resurrection and immortality. The number of persons who had these doubts seems to have been small. In refuting their notions, Paul begins with the cardinal fact of Christ's resurrection, and having proved its reality, adopts it as the basis of his reasoning, grounding the fact of the general resurrection upon it. He then adverts to the *how* of the question, lessening the difficulty by stating that the resurrection body will be a *spiritual*, not a *natural*, organism.

The apostle *heard* of these improprieties. We shall now advert to other topics, about which he had been asked by letter.

6. The subject of celibacy was one that perplexed part of the Christian church at Corinth. It is not easy, however, to discover the precise point to which their question referred, because the writer touches on several things in his answer. He speaks first of marriage generally, recommending that state to all as one preventive of fornication. At the same time, he prefers a single life for those who could purely bear it. He condemns separations and divorces, even though one of the parties be a heathen, as long as the unbeliever chooses to continue with the other. After a short digression, he turns to the unmarried, recommending them to remain single because of impending calamities ; and touches at the end on the marriage of widows. What then was the particular point of inquiry ? Was it, as Hofmann supposes, whether an unmarried man should entirely abstain from sexual contact with a woman ; or, as Hilgenfeld thinks,

[1] Comp. 2 Maccabees vii. 9, 11, 14, 23. Like the author of the book of Daniel, the Maccabean writer limits the resurrection to pious Jews, apparently excluding all Gentiles.

was the question whether it were not advisable that men generally, even the married, should not touch a woman? The latter is more probable. The notion of attaching undue value to celibacy was an Essene one; but the apostle, though inclined to that view, carefully limits it.

It is difficult to discover the party among whom a preference for celibacy had appeared. The Pauline Christians may have overvalued celibacy, because Paul was unmarried. But even this is doubtful, because the adherents of Paul, in after times, never insisted on a single life. An ascetic spirit had appeared among the Corinthians, leading some to argue for celibacy as a state of peculiar virtue. This disposition showed itself early in the primitive churches and arose out of temperament. Perhaps it was fostered by the Christ party, and was of Palestinian origin.

While treating of the marriage relation, the apostle lays down a general maxim which deserves particular notice. In whatever situation Christianity finds an individual, it does not interfere with his external relations, nor command him to start off abruptly from former pursuits. The existing order of society was outwardly undisturbed by the new religion. This is applied to the case of slaves. Primitive Christianity did not enjoin masters to set their slaves at liberty. It prepared them to be kind and benevolent towards that class. Slaves themselves were exhorted to submit patiently to the yoke. But Paul did not undervalue civil liberty. He advised every slave to avail himself of a legitimate opportunity to obtain his emancipation. 'If thou mayest be made free, use it rather.' From this application of a general principle to the state of slaves, we infer that he looked upon the institution as uncongenial with the spirit of Christianity.

7. Another question related to the duties of Christians respecting flesh previously offered to idols. Some Gentile converts not only ate without scruple meat sold

in the market, after it had been dedicated to idols, but partook of the feasts held in heathen temples, at which such flesh was set before the guests. This conduct gave offence to Jewish Christians, whose weak consciences naturally revolted at idolatry.

In replying to the inquiry addressed to the apostle on this subject, he notices three points, as if three questions had been asked. Should a Christian eat the flesh of an animal offered in sacrifice to idols, after that flesh has been exposed for sale and purchased as food? Should a Christian accept the invitation of a friend to partake of a feast held in a heathen temple? Should a Christian go to a private entertainment and eat the flesh of animals dedicated to idols? He replies to the first in the affirmative, mentioning, however, a limit to the exercise of Christian freedom. Care must be taken not to offend a weak brother, since an action harmless in itself ceases to be indifferent when it hurts the feelings or prejudices of a tender conscience. He answers the second in the negative, because every Christian present at idol-feasts makes himself a sharer in the idolatrous worship. As to the third, he allows a Christian to eat everything set before him at a private entertainment. But if any guest should say of a particular dish, 'this meat has been offered in sacrifice to an idol,' the believer is exhorted to abstain, out of regard to the conscience of others.

This topic relates to the Pauline and Petrine parties. The weak were the Jewish Christians, who had scruples of conscience about countenancing idolatry, and allowed their minds to be harassed with anxiety when there was no real ground for it. The Pauline Christians, on the other hand, entertaining correct notions of freedom, joined without scruple in festive entertainments where flesh left after sacrifices was used, and paid little regard to the uneasiness of the Petrine Christians. Very wisely does the apostle deal with the question by enforcing the

law of love to modify things in themselves indifferent. That law binds the believer to act in accordance with the spiritual benefit of others.

It would be unnecessary to mention the opinion of Meyer and Hofmann, that *the weak* are *Gentile* Christians, were it not that it derives support from the critical reading of Lachmann and Tischendorf, in viii. 7, '*with conscience until now* of the idol, eat it as a thing offered to an idol,' &c.,[1] meaning that their conscience was transferred from their heathen state to their Christian one, in supposing that an idol was a real thing.[2] The reading, though attested by external evidence, is hardly placed beyond doubt; and even if it were, it seems far-fetched to restrict the phrase *till now*, to the noun alone that precedes it, instead of to the whole clause.

8. Another subject referred to the apostle, was the demeanour of females in public meetings. Misapplying Christian liberty, females appeared unveiled in congregations of worshippers composed of both sexes; a practice adopted in imitation of the men, who, according to Greek custom, appeared with uncovered heads. This was an improper application of their privileges, as if they stood on a perfect equality with the male sex. They even prayed and prophesied in the public assemblies unveiled. The apostle condemns the custom of removing the veil in promiscuous meetings of worshippers, as well as that of praying and prophesying in public; though he reserves his denunciation of the latter to a subsequent occasion (xii. 34). He reminds woman of her subordination to man; showing their true relation to one another and to Christ; and indicates that the *tendency* of the custom of appearing in public meetings with uncovered heads is immoral.

9. The Corinthian church enjoyed a large measure

[1] τῇ συνειδήσει ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου, κ.τ.λ.

[2] *Exeget. Handbuch über den ersten Brief an die Korinther*, p. 176, 2nd edition.

of spiritual gifts. These were not equivalent to what are now called *miraculous*, but consisted in the elevation of the natural faculties. The excitement produced upon susceptible spirits by a new religion in the apostolic age was often extraordinary. But unworthy motives interfered with the exercise of spiritualised feelings; and their exhibition was unedifying. In an ecstatic state, the Corinthians used words inarticulate, disconnected, confused, which conveyed little meaning to the hearer, because the speakers themselves were not conscious of a meaning. The charism did not consist in the ability to speak foreign languages, as has been often supposed, but in impassioned exclamations, and in obscure, incoherent outbursts of prayer. The gift was overrated by its possessors, and used for ostentation because it excited wonder in the hearers.

The apostle enters into a minute consideration of the subject of charisms, pointing out their right use. Prophesying is preferred to speaking in tongues, because it tends to edification. Love, however, is put above all gifts, because it regulates their exercise.

10. The only other question of the Corinthian church relates to a collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem, about which the apostle gives some directions.

### PAUL'S VISITS TO THE CORINTHIANS BEFORE HE WROTE TO THEM.

It has been debated whether Paul visited Corinth once or twice before he wrote to the believers there. The Acts notice only one visit. The supposition of a second is derived from passages in the epistles themselves, from 2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2; xii. 14; ii. 1; xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 7. As the two visits must have preceded the first epistle, because the second could not have happened between the first and second epistles, passages from both epistles are relevant.

'This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. I told you before, and foretel you, as if I were present, the second time; and being absent now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that if I come again, I will not spare' (2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2). These words plainly express the idea that the writer purposed to pay the readers a third visit.

'Behold, the third time I am ready to come to you; for I seek yours, not you,' &c. (2 Cor. xii. 14). The meaning is the same as before. The apostle was ready to visit them the third time. The preceding context—'for what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me this wrong'—contains keen irony, and agrees best with the supposition that the writer had been at Corinth twice. The greater the number of his visits during which he had received no maintenance from the people, the severer his irony.

2 Cor. ii. 1 is less explicit. 'I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness.' The apostle had not gone to them in sorrow, as we learn from Acts xviii. 1; neither can it be said that he was humbled on the occasion of his first visit (xii. 21). A subsequent and sorrowful visit is therefore implied. 'For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit' (1 Cor. xvi. 7). These words intimate that his next visit would be of some length, compared with the passing one he had last paid. The first was nearly two years, and therefore he must have been again with them for a short time.

But 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, presents an apparent objection to this view. 'And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before, that ye might have a second benefit; and to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you to be brought on my way towards Judea.' If two visits

to Corinth are presupposed elsewhere, why should he speak of *one* benefit conferred by his personal presence? Why not intimate *two benefits*, and so mention a *third*, 'that ye might have a third benefit?' This reasoning is plausible but not conclusive. To meet it, we need not assume, with Bleek,[1] after Chrysostom, that *a second benefit* is equivalent to *a second joy*. The apostle speaks of an intended journey, before the sending of his first epistle; and the second benefit refers to his second presence with them, after returning from Macedonia, as is expressed in the sixteenth verse. It leaves out of account the apostle's first abode at Corinth, and alludes solely to his purpose of seeing the Corinthians, on his return from Macedonia, as well as on his way to it. This is better than to suppose that, during the apostle's residence at Corinth of eighteen months, he had gone into the neighbouring districts, and returned to Corinth, so that in one sense he had been there twice, in another only once; in which case he could speak of another visit, either as the third or second. It is remarkable that Schott and Anger should defend an hypothesis so improbable.

There are other difficulties against the assumption of an unnoticed visit to Corinth. If the state of the church was such as to give uneasiness to the apostle at the time of his visit, as is inferred from 2 Cor. xii. 21, ii. 1, it is not easy to understand how his first epistle could omit all mention of that visit, and of his efforts against the disorders he had then witnessed. If the church were not thus distracted, the interpretation of the passages referred to falls away; and it is incomprehensible how the community could have speedily become so bad, since the visit must have preceded the first epistle by a very short interval. Ingenious as these suggestions of De Wette's are,[2] the testimony of plain

[1] In the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1830, p. 614, *et seq.*

[2] *Einleitung*, § 132a, 6th ed.

words, in their natural acceptation, must not be abandoned on their account.

In view of all that has been said in favour of the second visit by Bleek and Holsten,[1] we cannot but assent. There are difficulties in its way, which have been forcibly urged by Baur; but they are not insuperable. Greater ones attend its rejection.

At what place of the Acts it should be inserted, can only be conjectured. It is best to put it during the apostle's abode at Ephesus of nearly three years' length (Acts xix.), as Schrader and others do. To put it elsewhere, in the year and a half's sojourn at Corinth, with Schott and Anger; or in the interval between his first and second visit to Ephesus, as Neander conjectures, is less probable.

### THE FIRST EXTANT EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, NOT THE FIRST WHICH THEY RECEIVED FROM THE APOSTLE.

We have assumed that the present epistle was preceded by a lost one, on the basis of v. 9, 'I wrote unto you *in the epistle*,' &c. These words are rendered either, 'I have written to you in this epistle,' or, 'I wrote to you in that epistle.' In the former case, they refer to the letter he was writing; in the latter, to one he had written. We demur to the view that the aorist of the verb[2] may be translated here, 'I have written.' The only correct version of it is, 'I wrote.' Bishop Middleton[3] refers to various places where the article conveys the sense, 'the *present* epistle;' but none is pertinent, because the expression in question occurs at the end of the writing. The letters in which the phrase appears are virtually finished. *The epistle* can only mean the present epistle when it is written, not when it is towards

[1] *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Teil i. p. 187, &c.

[2] ἔγραψα.

[3] *The Doctrine of the Greek Article*. Rose's ed. p. 324.

the beginning. That the same phrase may mean *a former epistle*, is shown by 2 Cor. vii. 8.

It is impossible to find the part to which the writer alludes, if *the letter* means that which he was then writing. The reference is neither anticipative, as Lardner and others suppose, nor is it to the verses immediately preceding.[1] No part of the context contains an injunction not to company with fornicators, for the whole exhibits no more than a general exhortation to purity, and an expectation, on the writer's part, that his readers should not delay to excommunicate the notorious offender. Supposing that the reference is to the second verse, or to the fifth, sixth, and seventh verses of the chapter, what is the use of the phrase *in the epistle?* The general sense does not require it.

The opinion that a lost epistle is referred to, which the words themselves justify, gave rise to two apocryphal ones: one purporting to proceed from the Corinthians, the other from St. Paul. They were published in Armenian, with a Latin translation by Wilkins;[2] and in the same year by Philipp Masson in Armenian and Latin;[3] Fabricius also gave them in Latin and Greek, in the third part of his 'Codex Apocryphus N. T.' They were inserted by Whiston in his collection of authentic records belonging to the Old and New Testament, in Latin, English, and Arabic, with a defence of their authenticity.[4] His two sons afterwards edited them in Armenian, Greek, and Latin, as an appendix to their edition of Moses Choronensis's history.[5] The best and most complete translation is that

[1] The aorist ἔγραψα may stand for the present γράφω; but the New Testament usage of it in this way cannot be fairly shown. The nearest approach to it is the reference to a group of verses just completed, in 1 Cor. ix. 15; 1 John ii. 21, 26; v. 13. See Winer's *Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, § 40, p. 278, Thayer's translation.

[2] Amsterdam, 1715, 4to.

[3] *Histoire critique de la République des Lettres*, vol. x. p. 150, *et seq.*

[4] Part ii. p. 585, &c., 1719.
1736, 4to., London, p. 371, &c.

made by Father Aucher and Lord Byron, published in Moore's life of the latter.[1] The letters are manifest forgeries, not earlier than the eleventh century. It is strange that their authenticity should have found a second defender in Rinck, when Whiston's own sons hesitated to accept it.

## AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the first epistle to the Corinthians has not been called in question except by Bruno Bauer. Early Christian writers always assigned the work to Paul. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp quote or allude to it, perhaps also Justin Martyr. The first writes: 'Take up the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul; what did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel? Of a truth he wrote to you by the Spirit concerning himself, and Cephas and Apollos, because you had even then formed parties.'[2] Ignatius says: 'It is becoming, therefore, that in every way you should glorify Jesus Christ, who has glorified you; that in one obedience ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, and may all speak the same thing of the same thing.'[3] And again: 'The cross, which is a stumbling-block to unbelievers, but to us salvation and eternal life. Where is the wise? Where is the disputer? Where is the boasting of them who are called prudent?'[4] Polycarp

[1] Vol. vi. pp. 274, 275.

[2] Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν, περὶ αὐτοῦ τε, καὶ Κηφᾶ τε, καὶ Ἀπόλλω, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι.—*Ep. ad. Cor.* c. 47. Comp. also 1 Cor. x. 24 with ch. xlviii.; xii. 12 with ch. xxxvii.; xiii. with ch. xlix.; xv. 20 with ch. xxiv.; ii. 9 with ch. xxxiv.

[3] Πρέπον οὖν ἐστιν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δοξάζειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δοξάσαντα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ ἦτε κατηρτισμένοι τῷ αὐτῷ νοὶ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ· καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.—*Ad Ephes.* c. 2.

[4] Ὅ ἐστιν σκάνδαλον τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία, καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ συζητής; ποῦ καύχησις τῶν λεγομένων συνετῶν;—*Ad Ephes.* c. 18.

has the following: 'Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?'[1] Again: 'Neither fornicators, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, shall inherit the kingdom of God,' &c.[2] Justin Martyr writes: 'For Christ was the passover, who was afterwards sacrificed,' &c.[3] Irenæus is the first author who expressly cites the epistle as Paul's: 'This also the apostle (Paul) manifestly shews in the epistle addressed to the Corinthians, saying: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud,"' &c.[4] So too Athenagoras: 'It is therefore manifest that, according to the apostle, this corruptible must put on incorruption.'[5] Clement of Alexandria has: 'The blessed Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians has solved the question, when he writes thus: "Brethren, be not children in understanding,"' &c.[6] Tertullian has the following passage: 'Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of them who denied or doubted a resurrection.'[7] It was also in Marcion's canon.

## ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into four parts, viz. i. 1–iv. 21; v. 1–xi. 1; xi. 2–xiv. 40; xv. xvi.

[1] Ἢ οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινοῦσιν;—*Ad Philipp.* c. 11.

[2] Καὶ οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε μαλακοί, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν, οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα.—*Ad Philipp.* c. 5.

[3] Ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τυθεὶς ὕστερον.—*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 374, ed. Thirlby.

[4] 'Et hoc autem Apostolum in epistola quæ est ad Corinthios manifestissime ostendisse, dicentem: Nolo enim vos ignorare, fratres, quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt, &c.'—*Adv. Hæres.* iv. 273, p. 1059, ed. Migne.

[5] Εὔδηλον παντὶ τὸ λειπόμενον, ὅτι δεῖ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο καὶ διασκεδαστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.—*De Resurrect. Mort.* 18, p. 266, ed. Otto.

[6] Σαφέστατα γοῦν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἀπήλλαξεν ἡμᾶς τῆς ζητήσεως ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ, ὧδέ πως γράφων· Ἀδελφοί, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, κ.τ.λ.—*Pædagog.* i. p. 118, ed. Potter.

[7] 'Paulus in prima ad Corinthios notat negatores et dubitatores resurrectionis.'—*De Præscript. Hæreticorum*, c. 33.

1. This section relates to the party divisions in the church, which the writer censures and endeavours to heal.

After the usual salutation the apostle congratulates his readers on their reception of the gospel, accompanied with abundant gifts and graces. He beseeches them to be united in love, instead of being divided into contending parties; thanks God that he had furnished no ground for undue attachment to his person, since he had baptised very few, his chief object being to preach. The believers are warned against worldly wisdom, as opposed to the gospel where all true wisdom centres in the cross (i. 1–31).

He describes how he had preached the crucified One among them, not according to the forms of learning or philosophy, but in unadorned simplicity, lest his success should seem due to human eloquence. The fleshly man cannot discern excellency or wisdom in such a theme; to him it is foolishness: it is only he who has the Spirit of God and therefore spiritual discernment, that receives and comprehends it as the highest wisdom (ii.).

The Corinthians had made so little progress in piety that the apostle could not address them as spiritual Christians. To this he attributes their aberrations and divisions; for instead of attaching themselves solely to Christ, they had shown undue partiality to human instrumentality. But none other foundation can be laid than Christ himself, and every one must look to the nature of the materials which he builds up, lest the structure prove unable to stand the fiery test of the great day (iii.). For himself, he was perfectly convinced of his apostolic calling, and was comparatively indifferent to the opinions of men, from whom he had not sought the praise due to faithful stewards of the divine mysteries. The sufferings he had to endure were the true proof of his apostleship and disinterestedness. His self-denying labours are alluded to not for the pur-

pose of upbraiding his readers, but to show the disinterestedness required in preachers of the gospel. Whatever instructors they had, *he* was their spiritual father; and he beseeches them to follow none other gospel than what they had received from his lips (iv.).

2. The second part is occupied with matters that concerned the private rather than the public relations of the Corinthian converts, but not exclusively.

The apostle condemns his readers for associating with an incestuous person, whom he commands them to expel from the church, and have no intercourse either with him or any immoral member (v.). He censures them for taking their disputes before heathen tribunals, instead of settling them by mutual arbitration. So far from bearing injuries patiently, they had injured others. But such practices must preclude admission into the kingdom of heaven. Though they had been great sinners in their heathen state, Christianity demands purity; and a believer's body must be holy, because it is the temple of the Holy Spirit (vi.). In the seventh chapter he answers the question that had been addressed to him respecting marriage, touching on various collateral topics not included perhaps in the letter. The subject of Christian liberty is next treated, with special reference to the use of flesh once dedicated to idols. Here he presents himself as an example to the Corinthians, whence they might perceive how he had abstained from lawful enjoyments, in order to recommend the gospel more effectually, by accommodation to the wants and even the prejudices, of others. He did not avail himself of his Christian liberty to the full extent; he had not married; he had taken from them no temporal support, but had laboured with his hands to supply his necessities (ix.). The melancholy effects of abusing freedom are shown in the history of the Israelites; and the Corinthians are warned lest they too should be overtaken in a false security (x. 1–xi. 1).

3. The third division treats of the public relations of Christians.

Here the apostle condemns irregularities existing among the Corinthians in the worship of God, such as the appearing of females in their assemblies, with uncovered heads, whereas a becoming distinction should be observed between males and females in this particular, as a token of the latter's modesty and subjection (xi. 2–16). Abuses connected with the Lord's supper are also censured, the apostle expounding the mode of its institution as he had received it by revelation (17–34). He proceeds to consider the gift of tongues, and the relation it bears to similar gifts generally, affirming that every one who speaks in the spirit acknowledges Jesus to be the Lord—that such confession proves him to have received the spirit who is manifested in various ways. All charisms have one object, the edification of the church. None should be preferred above another, since all are necessary; just as the different members of the body have each an important function to perform (xii.). This unity of spiritual gifts, both in their origin and object, commends the great principle of love, which is above them all, and without which they are valueless. Here the writer graphically describes the nature of love, representing it, with faith and hope, as one of the three cardinal virtues, and preferring it even to them (xiii.). After this he speaks of the two gifts of tongues and prophesying, showing that the former should not be exercised indiscriminately, since it is useless unless accompanied with interpretation; while the other is intelligible by itself (xiv. 1–33). Women are enjoined to be silent in churches; and all things should be conducted with propriety and order in the public meetings of the saints (34–40).

4. The fourth part relates to the resurrection, which some in the church denied; and concludes with a few general directions.

The fifteenth chapter discusses the doctrine of the resurrection, and asserts its necessary connection with the leading truths of Christianity. The apostle affirms the inseparable union between Christ's resurrection and that of believers. He rests his argument for a general resurrection on Christ's rising from the dead, showing with what intensity of belief he held the latter. All faith he holds to be vain, unless Christ rose from the dead. His reasoning is of the passionate, ardent kind so conspicuous in the epistle to the Romans, in which the heart controls the head. Whatever be thought of its conclusiveness, it has its value to the Christian of every age, teaching him that intensity of conviction accompanied by supreme love to God and man, ennobles its subject. An illustration borrowed from the organism of plants, to prove that a resurrection of the body is consistent with reason and nature, so far from implying that the same body rises, indicates the reverse. And the three verses 39–41 imply that the same body will not appear again. The analogy of multiplied and varied organisations in nature shows diversity. The flesh of animals; heavenly and earthly bodies; the splendour of the sun, moon, and stars are different; why should the resurrection body not follow analogy? The distinction between the earthly and resurrection body is summed up in the phrases, *psychical body*, *pneumatic body*, which convey no definite ideas to us. In the one, the *psyche*, i.e. *animal life*, is the predominant agent, and the *pneuma* is subordinate; in the other, the *pneuma*, the spirit rules, and the *psyche* has ceased to be a principle. Perhaps the writer's idea was that the resurrection body is to be a new and higher form of the old one; not an entirely new structure, but a renovated form of the old, divested of earthly materials and developed out of the present. Such is Lüdemann's view; though in comparing 1 Cor. xv. 36, &c., with 2 Cor. v. 4, he does not notice the discrepancy.[1]

[1] See *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus*, p. 149.

It is also observable, that the death of Adam and of all mankind in him, is spoken of, not as the consequence of his sin, but of an earthly nature (xv. 44–47). On the contrary, Adam's sin is stated to be the cause of his death in the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. Are these representations of the apostle consistent? Fritzsche supposes they are not; Meyer has a laboured note to show their harmony. It is one of the antinomies in Paul's writings, which must be allowed to stand side by side; being connected with the wider antinomy which the apostle's doctrine presents respecting the change in man's nature; for in the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, sin is supposed to have its origin in the psychological nature of man, in the material styled his *flesh*; whereas in the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, Adam's sin is represented as the efficient cause of the principle of natural sinfulness. According to the former, Adam's sin produced no change in the moral nature of man; according to the latter, a new principle of sinfulness came in by that very means. It is better not to attempt the reconciliation of the two than to do it and fail. We agree with Pfleiderer in thinking it *exegetically* impossible.

The last chapter recommends the contribution for the poor at Jerusalem, informs them of the writer's intended journey to Corinth, subjoins admonitions, and concludes with some salutations (xvi.).

The apostle, who had himself founded the Corinthian church, specially loved it, and nurtured it with uncommon care. The relations between the spiritual father and his offspring were intimate and confidential. His experiences among these converts were diversified, his difficulties peculiar; and the human side of his individuality is seen in what he writes to them more clearly than in any other epistle. His practical sagacity, spiritual insight, tact, and delicacy were called into exercise by the weighty problem to be solved—the

planting of a new religion in Greek soil. Experiences among the people prepared him for dealing with them wisely, and for applying Christian principles to the full reality of concrete life.

The epistles are unlike those to the Romans and Galatians. In the letter to the Galatians truth appears in its rougher elements, strength taking the place of fineness; in that to the Romans it passes into the abstract domain of doctrinal propositions and contrasts; it is seen here in the manifestations of actual life. The theology is ethical not doctrinal, entering into relations public and private, healing disorders, correcting mistakes, and furnishing wholesome precepts. Nowhere is the many-sidedness of the apostle's mind so evident—the breadth and largeness of view that touch topics of multifarious difficulty with masterly ability. The Spirit of God had endowed him beyond ordinary humanity, not in vain, as the letters to the Corinthians demonstrate. All his powers were needed for the successful solution of the problem, which the first church reared on the classic ground of ancient Greece presented; nor did they fail to meet it successfully.

# SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

## ACCOUNT OF THE APOSTLE BETWEEN THE WRITING OF THE FIRST AND SECOND EXTANT EPISTLES.

We have assumed that Timothy did not go as far as Corinth, but returned from Macedonia to Ephesus without a report of the affairs at Corinth. There is no mention of his visiting Corinth in 2 Cor. xii. 18, although it might have been looked for there; nor is it alluded to in Acts xix. 22. It is said, indeed, in explanation, that as Timothy is associated with the apostle in writing the epistle, a notice of his mission in the third person would have been inappropriate; but Timothy is associated with Paul in the Philippian letter, which contains notices in the third person nothwithstanding (ii. 19). Nor can it be urged that some remark and apology would have appeared in this epistle, if the journey had been abandoned, as long as we are ignorant of the circumstances which induced Timothy to stop short of Corinth. No charge of fickleness could have been founded upon a journey carried out only in part; at least against the apostle, as long as he had sent Timothy. If the messenger was disheartened, and feared to proceed to Corinth, or if he saw fit to return sooner than he had purposed, the sender could not be held responsible. All that Meyer suggests against the hypothesis of an unfinished visit to Corinth is invalid. When the apostle found that his young friend returned without the wished-for intelligence, he sent Titus (vii. 14,

15 ; xii. 17, 18), the object of whose mission is not stated. It is likely that the writer despatched his friend to observe and strengthen the effect which the first epistle made upon the church. Titus would be expected to bring back intelligence of the state of parties after the letter had been received, and of the general feeling towards the writer.

Did he bear a letter on this occasion ? Bleek[1] assumes that he did, and some passages in the second extant epistle apparently countenance the idea : 'And I wrote this same unto you, lest when I came I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice ; having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all,' &c. &c. (ii. 3, 4). Here Paul says that he wrote his reproof to the Corinthians respecting the incestuous person in a very painful state of mind, accompanied with many tears. The passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians, v. 1–8, is pronounced not strong enough to justify the inference of its being here alluded to, and therefore a lost letter must be assumed. The language is not sufficiently severe or painful ; neither is the topic of the incestuous man a prominent one in the first epistle. That the allusion to 1 Cor. v. 1, &c., is felt to be unsuitable appears from the fact that some critics connect the apostle's words in ii. 3, 4, with the 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters of the first epistle ; while Schrader connects them with the whole letter. This reasoning is inconclusive. The first verse of the 5th chapter of 1 Cor. must have caused pain to the writer and sorrow to the readers—how much, can only be conceived. The apostle says in 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, that he had written to the Corinthians a reproof about the incestuous person which had caused them grief, out of affection for them, that he might not have sorrow after his arrival. He did not wish to visit them personally while

[1] In the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1830, iii. p. 625, *et seq.*; repeated in his *Einleitung*, p. 402, *et seq.*

irregularities existed that must awaken painful feelings; but had sent them a letter that they might repent, and so prepare for a joyful meeting. The 5th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians *does* contain reproofs, and to it the present passage may be suitably applied.

Another place to which Bleek refers in justification of his opinion is 2 Cor. vii. 8–14. But nothing there requires the assumption of a lost letter; neither the interpretation of the participle translated 'he that suffered wrong,'[1] nor of the phrase, 'our boasting, which I made before Titus.'[2] The former does not mean *Paul himself*, but *the father of the incestuous person;* while the latter, instead of signifying the praise given by Paul to Titus (in a letter now lost), means the commendation of the Corinthians in the presence of Titus before his departure.

If it be thought strange that the apostle should have despatched Titus to Corinth during the critical circumstances of the church in that city without an epistle, it must be remembered that a long letter had been written shortly before; and that the author had neither received an account of the mode in which it had been accepted, nor of the impression it had made. After so brief an interval it would have been precipitate to despatch another.[3]

These observations must suffice to indicate our dissent from the view of Bleek, who has been followed by Credner, Neander, Ewald, Klöpper, and Hilgenfeld. Hausrath finds the alleged lost epistle in a part of the present second one to the Corinthians (chapters x.–xiii.), written before chapters i.–ix. By assuming an epistle in the interval we get more room for the circumstances implied in the second of the extant ones, especially for the culmination of the Judaising agitation in Corinth,

[1] *ὁ ἀδικηθείς.*

[2] *ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου.*

[3] See Rückert's *Der zweite Brief Pauli an die Korinther bearbeitet*, p. 417, *et seq.*

which was overpowered by the firmness of the apostle. In like manner the apparent difficulty of referring 2 Cor. ii. 5–8 and vii. 8–12 to the incestuous person, is more easily removed. But there is no necessity for the hypothesis ; while the allusion to Satan in 2 Cor. ii. 11, points to 1 Cor. v. 5, where the incestuous man is the subject.

After Titus left the apostle, a violent uproar arose at Ephesus. The success attending his preaching alarmed the selfishness of Demetrius, whose lucrative employment was to manufacture small models of the temple of Artemis. Perceiving that his craft was in danger, this artisan called his workmen together, and easily inflamed their minds against the man whose teaching brought the goddess into disrepute. In consequence of his representations, the artificers ran tumultuously through the city, filling it with confusion. Seizing Aristarchus and Gaius, they hurried them away to the theatre. At length the populace drew forth Alexander from among the multitude ; the Jews also putting him forward, that he might exonerate them, by throwing blame on the Christians. But the people would not hear him when they understood that he was a Jew ; because Jews as well as Christians were considered enemies to the heathen gods.

After the ignorant rabble had exhausted their fury, the recorder of the city addressed them, quieting their turbulence by reminding them of the illegality of their conduct and the hazard they ran of being called to account. So the meeting dispersed.

### EFFECTS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE ON THE CHURCH AT CORINTH, AND ITS STATE WHEN THE APOSTLE WROTE HIS SECOND EXTANT ONE.

Leaving Ephesus, Paul proceeded to Troas, where he was disappointed in not meeting Titus, and repaired

to Macedonia. Here the messenger returned from Corinth, with a report satisfactory in the main. The letter had produced a salutary impression on the church. The members generally had acknowledged Paul's authority, and evinced their readiness to obey his commands. They expressed regret on account of irregularities, and were anxious to be reconciled to their spiritual father. The incestuous person had been treated according to the will of the apostle; for though the majority had not actually excommunicated him, they had recorded a sentence against him, agreeing with Paul's. The apostle expresses his satisfaction with their resolution, especially as the offender himself had become penitent; and declares that excommunication need not be carried out. On the contrary, he wishes them to confirm their love to the man by receiving him back to the communion of the church. The better portion of the people lamented their past conduct and wished for Paul's return. The intelligence communicated by Titus was so agreeable that the author exults in gratitude to God. 'Now thanks be unto God, which always causes us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place.' But all were not reduced to this state of mind. Corruptions existed which could not be removed in a day. The love of party lingered among them. The disposition of the majority to submit to the apostle's decisions and welcome him back, was not universal. He had still opponents, who persevered in undermining his reputation; and were, perhaps, all the more inimical, in proportion as the majority acknowledged his rightful claims. This will account for the tone of self-defence in many portions of the letter, the warnings it contains, the severe language adopted. Even in the laudatory passages, side glances at detractors appear. While praising the many, those who continued to thwart him are seldom lost sight of.

The insinuations derogatory to the writer, to which

he alludes in the way of refutation or self-defence, are these :—

(*a.*) He had said that he intended to proceed directly from Ephesus to Corinth, thence to Macedonia, and returning to Corinth, to stay till his departure for Jerusalem. The distracted state of the church induced him to change his purpose, because he was unwilling to treat them with severity. This alteration of plan his enemies turned to his disadvantage, charging him with fickleness, and inferring that his doctrine could be as little relied on as his promises.

(*b.*) They also accused him of vain glory and ostentation, because he spoke of himself so much. They did not distinguish between the grace of God and the human instrument.

(*c.*) These opponents directed attention to the contemptibleness of his person, contrasting the severity of his letters with the weakness of his body and worthlessness of his speech. They intimated that he threatened what he could not and would not perform ; that however formidable when absent, he was really timid. Being afraid to come, he preferred to threaten at a distance.

(*d.*) His opponents seem to have reproached him with preaching a mysterious veiled gospel, deficient in the simplicity of that proclaimed by the primitive apostles. He had said, 'we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom' (1 Cor. ii. 7) ; which may have been taken as the foundation of their charge ; and he now writes in reply, 'if our gospel be hid, it is hid in the perishing' (2 Cor. iv. 3).

(*e.*) One had come to Corinth with the sanction of some of the early apostles, preaching Ebionite Christianity in opposition to Paul (xi. 4). This new teacher led the apostle to affirm, that he had equal authority with the super-apostles, and that he preached the same Jesus. We cannot agree with Ewald, Holtzmann, and Hausrath in identifying the new teacher with one of the

twelve apostles whom the Judaisers had invited to Corinth ; nor with such as understand the case hypothetically.

Such are the principal charges combated in the second epistle. They may not have been advanced directly or openly. But they were made with persevering enmity.

Who were the contumacious adversaries ? Were they the Christ party ? Probably they were, as may be inferred from chapter v. 12, 13 ; x. 7.

## OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The preceding observations show the occasion on which the epistle was written. The writer's heart was moved with feelings of anxiety, fear, affection, distrust, and hope, from the time he had sent his first epistle, till Titus's return from Corinth with a report of the state of the church, favourable in some respects, unpleasant in others. His leading object was to establish his apostolic reputation, and to restore the erring to submission.

The manner in which he tries to accomplish the end is shown by the outline of the letter. Making a distinction between the church generally and the disturbers of its peace, he praises the former, as far as he could with truth ; for it was his endeavour to convince them of their faults, and win them to entire obedience. The latter he seeks to overpower. Beginning with an address to the church generally, so that he could speak in mild terms, he commends their manifestation of repentance and obedience. Praise is bestowed on the whole body ; no separation is made between the better and the more corrupt members. The writer expresses the same affection for all, and entertains good hopes of them. He proceeds to speak of himself, his life, sufferings, labours, and hopes, presenting the picture of a

man deeply conscious of the importance of his office, and pursuing its duties with singular earnestness. The patriot, marked by the absence of vain glory, but by dignity and consciousness of divine power, attracts the reader's admiration. The description flows from a full heart, without the semblance of rhetorical arrangement. The only skill seen is the result of warm outpourings from a heart intensely alive to the cause of truth.

Putting the less important part of the letter between the two leading divisions, the third exhibits an altered tone. Here the writer addresses his opponents, and triumphantly vindicates himself from all their aspersions. He threatens them severely with the exercise of his apostolic power, and invokes God to witness the purity of his motives.

### TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The epistle was written in Macedonia (ii. 13 ; vii. 5; ix. 2–4), *at Philippi*, according to the subscription ; which place is also in the Vatican MS. (but not from the original writer), in the Peshito, in K. L., and many other copies. This is improbable, because he had travelled farther in Macedonia than the place where it is likely he landed, as he speaks of the progress which the churches of the province had made in furthering the collection for the poor (viii. 1, &c.). Besides, he had waited in vain for the arrival of Titus in Macedonia (vii. 5), and anxiety did not allow of a long stay in Philippi, since his object was to go to Corinth immediately. Others, supposing Troas to have been its birth-place, appeal to 2 Cor. ii. 12 ; though the passage in its connection with the next verse, proves that Paul had left Troas. Nothing in the epistle favours one locality in Macedonia more than another. Some even think that it was not all written in one place, but at different times and localities on several journeys—an

opinion founded on a certain view of the letter as loose and disjointed.

The exact time of writing cannot be determined. Perhaps it was soon after the first epistle, as various circumstances show ; among which we may reckon the allusion to Paul's great peril at Ephesus (2 Cor. i. 4–10), caused by Demetrius—a fact which had happened recently. De Wette, however, disallows the reference of the passage to Acts xix. 23, &c., on the ground that his life was not then in imminent danger, thinking that, if Ephesus had been meant, he would have said so, instead of 'in Asia.' Others, as Rückert, have thought of a *severe sickness* which the apostle had had, a hypothesis favoured by some expressions but disagreeing with others. The treatment which Paul received in Ephesus, as far as it is described by the historian, seems insufficient to explain the strong language used towards the beginning of this epistle. It is therefore likely that something occurred which we do not know. Perhaps he had suffered bodily injuries in the streets of Ephesus, where he had been hunted and thrown down, as may be inferred from iv. 8–10 ; and still felt the effects of the violence to which he had been subjected. The language implies that his life had been in danger. The letter was composed towards the conclusion of the year in which the first was written, A.D. 57, some time before Paul's three months' sojourn in Achaia. A year did not elapse between the two. The phrase 'a year ago' is too indefinite to have that meaning (2 Cor. viii. 10). The bearers were Titus and two brethren, one of whom was chosen by the Macedonian churches to convey the contribution to Jerusalem. The brother, 'whose praise is in the gospel throughout the churches,' is usually identified with Luke. Others suppose Silas or Silvanus; De Wette proposes Trophimus. It is likely that the brother was unknown to the Corinthians and subordinate to Titus, a circumstance which excludes Luke.

The same uncertainty rests on the other companion of Titus, spoken of in the 8th chapter. He was probably Sosthenes, as Burton thinks.[1]

## UNITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

A few critics have entertained doubts about the integrity of the epistle, in consequence of various difficulties. Three things have occasioned them, as stated by Schleiermacher.[2]

1st. There are opposite statements respecting Titus. Paul requests for him a good reception among the Corinthians (viii. 23, 24); but he asks again, 'Did Titus make a gain of you? Walked we not in the same spirit? Walked we not in the same steps?' (xii. 18). This incongruity is easily removed. Titus had been already at Corinth, and xii. 18 refers to that visit. In viii. 23, 24, the writer asks for him a good reception again, when he should carry the present epistle to Corinth.

2nd. There are opposite statements respecting the apostle himself, as if he were now for the first time on the point of coming out of Macedonia (ix. 4), and again, as if he had been already at Corinth a second time (xii. 14; xiii. 1, 2), the latter of which cannot be reconciled with the narrative in the Acts.

This has been already explained.

3rd. A very different tone prevails at the beginning and end of the epistle. From being laudatory and mild, it becomes severe and harsh.

It is a common opinion that the epistle is made up of separate pieces written at different times, and cannot be looked upon as a connected whole. There are phenomena which countenance the prevailing critical view, such as the dissimilarity of the ninth chapter to what

[1] *Theological Works*, vol. iv. p. 84.

[2] *Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, pp. 154, 155.

precedes, especially the peculiar commencement with the particle *for*, and the different tone of the last four chapters beginning with the words, 'Now I Paul myself.' The disjointed character is noticeable enough; though the hypotheses founded upon it by Semler and others may be inadmissible. The unity is not justified by its defenders, nor by the exposition which Rückert gives.

The transition from the ninth to the tenth chapter is abrupt, and the writer's tone changes. Hitherto the apostle had complimented his readers, expressing his satisfaction with their state. He had insinuated delicate flattery and gentle praise, mingled with some regret that he had perhaps been too severe. Now he assumes a different style of address and becomes severe, asserting his authority, making a scornful comparison of his labours with those of others, and launching immoderate recriminations. The Corinthians, who had been described before as longing for the presence of their beloved teacher, are said to charge him with faults and feebleness. In the one part of the letter, they are praised for their Christian virtues; in the other, they are presented in different colours. This discrepancy between the contents has exercised the ingenuity of interpreters and given rise to various hypotheses; for the transition from praise to invective is striking and sudden.

There is nothing to forbid the idea that an interval elapsed between the composition of chapters i.–ix. and x.–xiii., during which the apostle had received fresh intelligence leading him to adopt a different tone. And it is *possible* that what is now the second part of the letter was written a considerable time before the first, as Weisse and Hausrath suppose. If there be a want of coherence between other portions, as there is between the eighth and ninth chapters, owing to the fact that the whole was not composed at one and the same time, probably chapters x.–xiii. were separated by time from

the rest. The only place at which an awkward break occurs is at vi. 14, where the connection is interrupted, being resumed at vii. 2. The paragraph (vi. 14–vii. 1) may be the addition of a later hand ; for it has all the appearance of an insertion.

The unity of the epistle need not be unduly sacrificed because of diversities, being explained by the state of the Corinthian church ; the majority of whose members were well disposed toward the apostle's person, while others were not. It is the latter who are specially addressed in chapters x.–xiii., and alluded to in the third person. *One* is singled out (x. 11) ; or the party is called *some* (x. 12). These had promoted discord in the church, and tried to undermine Paul's authority. After being assured of the attachment of the majority, the apostle directs his polemic against this minority, exposing their tendencies and vindicating his own work. There is reason for thinking them Judaisers. Believing that different parties are addressed in the discordant divisions of the epistle, it is only necessary for us to add, that the latter chapters (x.–xiii.) were appended to the others after a time. The whole letter in fact is made up of pieces written at intervals. The seventh chapter looks as though the epistle might have ended there ; the eighth is a sort of appendix to it ; and the ninth, resuming the subject of the eighth, begins with the remarkable word *for*. There are breaks enough to show that the writer was interrupted more than once, and added to what he had already written, out of varying knowledge and moods. Nor should his excited mind and suffering body be forgotten. The nervous subject of visions, whose fiery soul was stirred to its inmost depths by an accumulation of harassing circumstances, could not be a calm logician studying the proper connection between the parts of his letter. The relations between Paul and the Corinthian community had been disturbed by recent events, while he

himself was suffering from bodily ailments; so that he writes without general plan or method, giving expression to his ideas as they arise in fitful succession or with sudden impulse, irregular, yet characteristic withal.

### DICTION AND STYLE.

The language of the epistle is severely criticised by Eichhorn and Emmerling. It cannot be denied, that the mode of writing is rugged and awkward, harsher, obscurer, and looser than in Paul's other writings. Parentheses and digressions intersect the narrative, and disturb its sequence. Sentences are broken off, without any apparent reason for the interruption; and the tone is sometimes inflated. The epistle has not the ease or smoothness of the first. Examples may be seen in v. 1–4, where there is a mixture of figures and some confusion of idea. Other passages, as i. 3–7; x. 12–16, show a consciousness of obscurity in the mind of the writer, causing synonymous expressions, and prolixity without clearness. The sense of viii. 11 is obscure; so much so, that an inversion of the clauses has been assumed. Chap. vii. ver. 8 is awkwardly expressed, and the true meaning dark. In i. 11, the construction is doubtful and imperfect; xi. 6 is difficult, because the words are not the same as in Phil. iv. 12. The case has been overstated by Eichhorn and Emmerling. But a careful reader sees enough to convince him that the style and diction are inferior to Paul's usual mode. Roughness, obscurity, looseness, careless constructions, are frequent. The haste with which the letter was written, and the intense emotions agitating the apostle's bosom, as he travelled from place to place in Macedonia, help to explain the phenomena. The ideas are worthy of the great apostle; though they are clothed in a negligent garb. He never writes good Hellenistic Greek; but he was capable of expressing his concep-

tions in smooth and appropriate language. If he did not on this occasion, it arose from peculiar circumstances.

Rückert takes a very favourable view of the whole epistle, in structure, language, and adaptation to its object, pronouncing it a true masterpiece of rhetorical art; a judgment which errs as much on one side as Eichhorn's does on the other. In like manner, Meyer speaks of 'the oratorical art' conspicuous in the epistle, an expression liable to convey an erroneous idea, unless it be strictly defined; for, in one sense, there is an absence of art. The rhetoric is powerful and sharp, but has no studied arrangement. Without art, it produces all the impression, and more, of the best rhetoric fashioned after the most approved models. The letter is a spontaneous effusion, dictated in haste, unrevised; often irregular; uneven, inelegant; sometimes inflated, yet having remarkable delicacy and propriety; weighty, striking, severe.

The two epistles to the Corinthians show the writer's peculiar personality. A fiery strength of soul tempered by tenderness, a sense of personal freedom and independence united to leniency for the weak, a religious spirit of manifold flexibility, deep, glowing, intense, bent upon one great object amid perils and painful necessitudes, sacrificing all for the furtherance of that object; such characteristics are unique in the history of humanity. The epistles reveal the way in which he applied Christianity to the circumstances of ecclesiastical and social life, along with rules or suggestions bearing many relations.

## AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the letter has not been questioned except by Bruno Bauer. It is confirmed by the contents of the first epistle, and abundantly attested by early witnesses.

Irenæus writes: 'Paul has plainly said in the second to the Corinthians, "In whom the God of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers."'[1]

Clement of Alexandria has the following: 'The apostle calls the common doctrine of the faith a savour of knowledge in the second to the Corinthians, for until this day the same veil remains,' &c.[2] Again: 'Hence also Paul—Ye have these promises, says he, dearly beloved; let us cleanse our hearts from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.'[3]

Tertullian writes: 'For indeed they suppose that the apostle Paul in the second of the Corinthians forgave the same fornicator who he had declared in the first ought to be delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh.'[4]

Cyprian has the following: 'Likewise the blessed apostle Paul, full of the inspiration of the Lord, "Now he that ministereth," says he, "seed to the sower, will both minister bread,"' &c.[5]

## ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts: 1. i.-vii.; 2. viii. ix.; 3. x.–xiii.

[1] 'Quod autem dicunt, aperte Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios dixisse: "In quibus deus seculi hujus excæcavit mentes infidelium."'—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 7, § 1.

[2] Ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς γνώσεως ὁ ἀπόστολος τὴν δὲ κοινὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς πίστεως ὀσμὴν γνώσεως εἴρηκεν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους, Ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας, τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα, κ.τ.λ.—*Stromata*, iv. c. 16, p. 608, ed. Potter.

[3] Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος . . . . Ταύτας οὖν ἔχετε τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, φησίν, ἀγαπητοί· καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ.—*Strom.* iii. c. 11, p. 544, ed. Potter.

[4] 'Revera enim suspicantur, Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios eidem fornicatori veniam dedisse, quem in prima dedendum Satanæ in interitum carnis pronuntiarit,' etc.—*De Pudicitia*, c. 13.

[5] 'Item beatus apostolus Paulus, dominicæ inspirationis gratia plenus, "Qui administrat," inquit,' etc.—*De opere et eleemos.* ix. p. 608, ed. Migne.

The first contains the apostle's utterances respecting his personal fortunes, purposes, feelings, and desires during the interval between the former epistle and the present; allusions to the long-expected and favourable accounts he had received of the believers by Titus, and assertion of the dignity of his apostolic office, with the disinterested manner in which he had fulfilled it among the Corinthians.

The following paragraphs are contained in it: i. 3–14; 15–24; ii. 1–11; 12–17; iii.; iv.–vi. 10; vi. 11–vii. 16.

After the usual introduction, he thanks God for the consolation he had received in all his sufferings, and for the ability to comfort others in like circumstances; which leads him to refer to the imminent danger from which he had been recently delivered, owing in part to their prayers. Such intercession he expected from them because of his good conscience (i. 1–14). He then defends himself against the charge of fickleness because he had altered his purpose of visiting them in person, assuring them that it was not from fear or versatility of mind, but out of tenderness towards them (15–24). The mention of his desire not to give them pain brings up the subject of his former letter, with the case of the incestuous person. It was for this reason he wrote that epistle, with a troubled heart. Now he is satisfied with the discipline which the church had administered to the offender by his recommendation, and wishes the penitent to be restored (ii. 1–11). He proceeds to express his affection for them, and the anxiety he felt when he did not meet Titus at Troas, and travelled to Macedonia, hoping to find him there. But the intelligence he received at last was so welcome, that he breaks forth into an expression of praise to God who caused him always to triumph. In this manner he passes to himself (12–17). To obviate the suspicion of vain glory he appeals to what he had done at Corinth, but is careful to ascribe to God all the ability that

made him an efficient minister of the new covenant. This leads him to contrast the old with the new dispensation, and to touch upon the blindness of the Jewish nation as though a veil were on their minds during the reading of the Old Testament (iii.).

Returning to the frankness and freedom of his preaching, he states that he taught the whole truth without falsification, though it might not be received by all. He did not proclaim it with a view of exalting self, or with a mixture of selfish motives, but announced nothing except the pure light of the gospel, which God had made to shine in his heart. Conscious that he had been called to the apostolic work, he did not lose courage or confidence even amid sufferings; but knowing the living power of Christ in him, he was supported amid exposures to death, as he looked forward to the future glory that swallows up the remembrance of these light afflictions. To that eternal state he had regard, else he could not have acted and suffered as he did. But he knew that after laying aside the earthly body he should put on a new one received from heaven. With such hope, and remembering that all must stand before the judgment seat of Christ, he could appeal to the Corinthians in attestation of his fidelity. Animated by the love of Christ who died for all, the apostle did not live to himself but to the Saviour; not attaching importance to the earthly conditions of men, nor entertaining carnal ideas of the Messiah any more. In Christ everything becomes new, by reconciliation to God; and the commission to offer that reconciliation had been entrusted to the writer. As an ambassador for Christ, therefore, he beseeches his readers to be reconciled to God and become subjects of righteousness. Exhorting them not to restrain the grace of God as if they had received it in vain, he returns to himself in the duties of his office, stating that he had been very careful to give no offence, at all times, in all circumstances and

places ; in prosperity and adversity ; in thought, word, and deed ; in good and bad report ; by life or death (iv.–vi. 10).

To this pathetic address he subjoins various admonitions, warning the readers against association with the idolatrous heathen, lest they should be seduced into sin. As he begins to speak of the intelligence brought by Titus, and the effects of his first letter, he says : 'Understand me aright ; ascribe no evil design to me in writing the former letter. I have given you no cause to think so by my apostolic conduct in relation to you.' He had been uneasy till he heard of their repentance from Titus : then he was filled with joy. He was glad that his letter had affected them so much ; not that he took any pleasure in reproving, but rejoiced in the repentance of the guilty. The result had been the very thing he had in view. He could therefore repeat his former glorying in the converts at Corinth, rejoicing that Titus himself had returned well pleased (vi. 11–vii. 16).

2. In the second part, the writer encourages the Corinthians to complete the contribution they had begun to make for the poor Christians in Judea ; for which purpose he had sent Titus and two others to promote the work.

The apostle boasts of the liberal spirit displayed by the Macedonian churches, who had made a considerable contribution for the use of the poor believers in Judea, though in narrow circumstances themselves. He had desired Titus to call upon them to complete the work ; and hoped they would abound in liberality ; not that he commanded it, but showed that such conduct was conformable to the example of Christ, who denied himself for the good of mankind. And as they had begun to be generous a year ago, he hoped they would justify his good opinion of them. He did not mean that they should do all, and other churches nothing ; but that

they should give according to their ability. He had sent Titus to finish the matter, because the latter had a tender concern for them; and with him two brethren of tried principle, hoping that the Corinthians would justify his assertions in other churches respecting their liberality. In exhorting them to be generous, he reminds them that as they sowed in the present life, they might expect to reap hereafter; and that their liberality would promote the honour of God as well as the advancement of Christianity (viii. ix.).

3. He now assumes a severe tone towards the refractory enemies among them, asserts his apostolic power, exposes the false apostles who attempted to subvert his authority, and speaks reluctantly of his own merits, not from vain glory but concern for their good.

He beseeches the Corinthians not to compel him to use severity at his coming among them. Against his opponents he affirms, that Christ had armed him with authority, and that he should exercise it towards those who pretended that his letters only had weight, his bodily presence being mean and his speech contemptible, so that he durst not act or speak so boldly among them as his writing would indicate. He does not boast, as some of his enemies had done, of the fruits of other men's labours; nor does he assume the credit of anything which he had not really done; but hopes that through their instrumentality the kingdom of Christ would extend to surrounding regions. Far from praising himself on account of what had been done, he glories in the Lord alone (x. 1–18).

He now asks their indulgence for venturing to boast of himself, which he does out of solicitude for them, lest they should become estranged from him by the representations of other teachers. He believes that he is not inferior to the extra-super apostles, an expression which refers to the primitive apostles, not to Paul's Judaic opponents in Corinth. Though unskilful in

oratory, he is not deficient in knowledge. They had had abundant opportunities of proving his character. He refers them to his laborious services in preaching the gospel gratuitously; avowing his determination not to abandon that course, that his opponents might be deprived of a pretext for assigning unworthy motives. As for those adversaries, he charges them with deceitfulness, hypocrisy, and falsehood; and while indulging again in boasting, he apologises for it. In claiming for himself qualifications and prerogatives equal to those of his enemies, he enumerates the perils he had suffered for the gospel's sake (xi).

In the same boastful strain, visions and revelations are referred to, one in particular by way of example. But that ground is soon left and his infirmities dwelt upon. In excusing his boastful tone, he speaks of the signs he had wrought among them when he planted the truth in their midst; and of his perfect disinterestedness. Not only did he act so himself, but his messengers followed the example, taking no temporal support from the Corinthians. All this he adduces, not so much from a wish to defend himself as for their edification. Afraid that their factions were not done away, he anticipates grief on account of vices retained by some (xii.).

After telling them that he was about to visit them the third time, he announces the severe procedure he would follow at his coming. Since they wanted a proof of the power of Christ in him, they should find him able to give it. But he exhorts them to self-examination, hoping to be spared the necessity of severity. The letter concludes with a recommendation of unity, peace, and love; and a comprehensive prayer is offered, that the grace of Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit might be with them all (xiii.).

# EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

## INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE GALATIANS.

GALATIA or Gallogræcia was a province of Asia Minor, differing in extent at different times. It was peopled by Gauls or Celts, about 280 B.C., who, refusing to take part in the expedition of the main body against Greece, and joined by a portion of the repulsed army, pushed forward from Thrace, where they had settled for a time, to the Hellespont, crossed over to the opposite shore, and overran Asia Minor under their leaders Leonorius and Lutarius. They were invited by Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, to assist him against his brother, and were rewarded with a portion of his country. But they were not easily restrained from incursions on their neighbours, and their marauding expeditions became formidable. Princes followed the pernicious example of Nicomedes ; and few wars were undertaken without their co-operation. Their name became so terrible that the kings of Syria paid them tribute. At length they received an effectual check from Attalus king of Pergamus, who drove them back, confining them to the fertile plains between the Halys and the Sangarius. Here in ancient Phrygia they became incorporated with the original inhabitants and Greek settlers ; and were called Gallogræci or Grecian Gauls, by the Romans.

They appear to have retained their own language, customs, and institutions for a long time; since Jerome, in the fourth century, says their tongue was nearly the same as that of the Treviri. Along with their vernacular language they spoke Greek; the latter being used in public inscriptions and monuments. In the year 189 B.C. they were subjugated by the consul C. Manlius Vulso, and brought under the Roman yoke, but were still allowed to have their own princes, the last of whom, Amyntas, was murdered 26 B.C.; when Augustus converted Galatia into a Roman province, governed by a proprætor.[1]

Galatia in the New Testament may be either Galatia proper, that comparatively small tract of land in the interior of Asia Minor, within which Attalus confined the restless population; or the larger kingdom of Amyntas, which was converted into a Roman province, including portions of Lycaonia and Pamphylia with Phrygia. Many critics have supported the opinion that the Galatians of the Roman province are intended by Luke, in which case Derbe and Lystra in Lycaonia, with Antioch in Pisidia, were Galatian cities. Iconium was not,[2] because the south-eastern part of Lycaonia did not belong to the Roman province, as Böttger[3] supposes. It is therefore argued, that the Galatian churches consisted of Lycaonian and Pisidian Christians, the former chiefly in Derbe and Lystra, the latter in Antioch. But the New Testament does not seem to adopt the official appellation of Galatia, because Lycaonia is mentioned separately in the Acts of the Apostles, implying the use of Galatia proper (Acts xvi. 1–6; xviii. 23). Derbe and Lystra are expressly called cities of Lycaonia (xiv. 6). The popular acceptation of

[1] Mynster's *Kleine theologische Schriften*, p. 51, *et seq.*

[2] See Rückert's *Magazin für Exegese und Theologie des N. T.*, erste Lieferung, pp. 97–112.

[3] *Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Paulinischen Briefe*, dritte Abtheilung, § 1.

Galatia is favoured by the parallel examples of Phrygia, Mysia, Pisidia in the Acts, which occur in their geographical not their political sense. Hence Galatia proper must be meant, not new Galatia or the more extended Roman province; and its churches were chiefly in the leading towns, Ancyra, Tavium, Pessinus, and Gordium. Lystra, Derbe, Antioch in Pisidia are excluded. It has been disputed whether the Galatians were of pure Celtic or of Germanic origin. But if they spoke nearly the same language as the Treviri, they belonged to the latter stock. And the names of their leaders are German, Leonorius, Lutarius, Deiotarus, &c. It is true that the name *Galatians* is identical with *Celts*,[1] but this is not conclusive, on behalf of the people's Celtic origin, because the appellation originated at a time when the races north of the Alps were not accurately distinguished.[2]

The Gallic religion was sensuous and superstitious, consisting in rites and cruel ceremonies. The Phrygian worship of Cybele appealed to the senses and excited the passions of men. It is probable that the Galatians united the worship of Cybele with that of the Gallic deities. The commerce carried on in their chief towns drew a number of Jews thither, who, according to Josephus, enjoyed considerable privileges. These Jews were doubtless zealous in propagating their religion, and had made proselytes.

The first time the apostle Paul visited Galatia was on his second missionary journey, as related in the Acts of the Apostles. 'Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia,' &c. The conversion of the Galatians took place on this occasion, since the Asia which the Apostle was forbidden

[1] Γαλάται, Κέλται.

[2] See Wieseler's *Die deutsche Nationalität der Kleinasiatischen Galater*, 1877.

to preach in was not Asia Minor but *proconsular* Asia (Acts xvi. 6). When Paul set forth on his third missionary journey from Antioch, he came a second time to Galatia, as we infer from Acts xviii. 23. 'And after he had spent some time there (at Antioch) he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples.' The word *strengthening* or *confirming*, implies that the inhabitants had been already converted. Thus two visits are distinctly marked.

It is improbable that a journey prior to these two is intimated in Acts xiv. 6, though Koppe and others think so. 'The region that lieth round about' does not mean Galatia, but the region about Derbe and Lystra, cities which are assigned to Lycaonia. We know indeed that Galatia, as a Roman province, included parts of Lycaonia and Pisidia; but there are good reasons for believing that the word Galatia was used by the sacred writers in its popular sense, not in the wider and official one. Nor does the language of Gal. ii. 13 imply that the Galatians were personally acquainted with Barnabas, or lead to the conclusion that they had received a visit from Paul and Barnabas together at the time referred to in Acts xiv. 6. Koppe refers to the fact that the object of Paul's second missionary journey, as noticed in Acts xv. 36; xvi. 4, 5, was *to confirm* the churches; but it is sufficient to reply that those whose faith was strengthened on that journey did not include the Galatians, the subject being changed at xvi. 6, where the Galatians are introduced.

## TIME AND PLACE AT WHICH THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN.

The letter has been put at two extremes of date. According to some, it was the first of Paul's; according to others, the last. It stood first in Marcion's canon, as

we learn from Tertullian,[1] but it is uncertain whether his list was arranged on the chronological principle. Tertullian's opinion seems to have been that it was not. In modern times, the view that it is the earliest Pauline writing has been held by respectable critics, including Michaelis and Koppe; though no good argument can be adduced in its favour. The other extreme is that of Koehler and Schrader, the former of whom brings it down to A.D. 69, two years after Nero's death; while the latter dates it A.D. 64, in the [one] Roman imprisonment. Intermediate dates are numerous.

It was written after St. Paul's second visit to the Galatians, because there are intimations of his having been twice with them: 'Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God' (v. 21). The context shows that the second visit, not the first, is implied. 'Am I, therefore, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?' (iv. 16); or rather, 'Am I, therefore, hated by you, because I told you the truth?' on his second visit in all probability. 'Ye know how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the gospel unto you *at the first*' (iv. 13). This language agrees best with a second visit, for the expression translated *at the first*,[2] denotes properly, 'on the former of two occasions.' The expression, indeed, *may* mean nothing more than a time antecedent to that in which Paul wrote, as Fritzsche and Usteri understand it: but the former sense is the more probable. The apostle need not, and perhaps would not, have used the word at all, had he visited the Galatians but once before writing. These notices are not striking or decisive proofs that the writer had made a second visit to his readers; but they contain probable evidence of it.

The churches of Galatia were founded A.D. 52, and

[1] *Adv. Marcion.* v. 2, vol. i. p. 316, ed. Semler.

[2] τὸ πρότερον.

were revisited by the apostle in 55. Hence the epistle was written in or after the year A.D. 55. How long after? Immediately, according to those critics who rely on the expression 'so soon,' in i. 6. 'I marvel that ye are *so soon* changing from him that called you,' &c.; that is, shortly after his second visit. This interpretation, however, is precarious, because the context seems to limit the expression to the time of their conversion, not to that of his last leaving them. The change was speedy and unexpected. After embracing the gospel they soon fell away, and adopted opinions at variance with it. The phrase contributes little to a settlement of the date.

After travelling through Galatia and Phrygia, where he confirmed the believers, the apostle repaired to Ephesus, where he abode nearly three years, and wrote the epistle after hearing of the Galatian apostasy. So many think. At what period of the Ephesian sojourn, at its commencement, middle, or close, must be matter of conjecture. In other words, the epistle may have been written A.D. 57, if it be dated at Ephesus. In confirmation of this place a passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians has been adduced. 'Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye' (xvi. 1). As this injunction respecting a collection is not in the Galatian epistle, Cappellus conjectured that the latter was written immediately before that to the Corinthians; that Paul gave the bearer a verbal message about the money; and that the injunction being fresh in his mind when he began the epistle to the Corinthians, gave rise to the allusion. As, therefore, the writing of the Galatian letter was almost simultaneous with that of the first to the Corinthians, the place was the same—viz. Ephesus. The argument is perhaps more ingenious than valid, because the apostle may have given directions about the collection when he last visited the Galatians.

Some will think it more pertinent to compare various passages in the two epistles, showing the same ideas to have been in the writer's mind when composing them. In both he alludes to his infirmity in the flesh (Gal. iv. 13 ; 1 Cor. ii. 3). The same proverb is quoted in Gal. v. 9 ; 1 Cor. v. 6. Gal. v. 6 ; vi. 15 may also be compared with 1 Cor. vii. 19. But if similarities in idea and diction contribute to settle the date of an epistle, they are more numerous in relation to the second epistle to the Corinthians. Compare Gal. iii. 13 with 2 Cor. v. 21 ; vi. 7 with 2 Cor. ix. 6 ; i. 6 with 2 Cor. xi. 4 ; vi. 15 with 2 Cor. v. 17 ; iv. 17 with 2 Cor. xi. 2 ; i. 10 with 2 Cor. v. 11 ; i. 9, v. 21 with 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ; iii. 3 with 2 Cor. viii. 6. And several words are peculiar to the two Pauline epistles.[1] Professor Jowett has also pointed out the similarity of tone and feeling in them ;[2] to which may be added the cognate manner of dealing with antagonists. The affinities in question bring the epistle nearer the second to the Corinthians than the first. In pursuance of the same method, a comparison of the Galatian with the Roman epistle furnishes a closer parallel. Both set forth the relation of the law to the gospel, showing the inefficacy of the former to confer righteousness. Justification by faith without the deeds of the law is their common theme, in opposition to a Judaising tendency. The following table of parallels shows the striking coincidences of thought and diction between the two.

| GALATIANS. | ROMANS. |
|---|---|
| ii. 16.—For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. | iii. 20.—By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. |
| ii. 19.—For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. | vii. 4.—Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ. |

[1] *ἀπορεῖσθαι, κανών, κυροῦν, τοὐναντίον, φοβεῖσθαι, μήπως, κατεσθίειν* metaphorically.

[2] *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, &c.* vol. i. p. 243, 2nd ed.

| GALATIANS. | ROMANS. |
|---|---|
| iii. 6.—Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. | iv. 3.—Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousnees. |
| iii. 7.—They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. | iv. 11.—That he might be the father of all them that believe. |
| iii. 8.—And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. | iv. 17, 18.—As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations. . . . . So shall thy seed be. |
| iii. 9.—So then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. | iv. 23, 24.—Now it was not written for his sake alone . . . . but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe that Jesus, &c. |
| iii. 10.—For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, &c. | iv. 15.—Because the law worketh wrath. |
| iii. 11.—But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident, for the just shall live by faith. | iii. 21; i. 17.—But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, &c. |
| iii. 12.—And the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them. | x. 5.—For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man who doeth those things shall live in them. |
| iii. 15–18. | iv. 13, 14, 16. |
| iii. 22.—But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. | xi. 32.—God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. |
| iii. 27.—As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. | vi. 3.—Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, &c. |
| iii. 29.—And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. | ix. 8.—The children of the promise are counted for the seed. |
| iv. 5, 6.—To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ. | viii. 14–17.—For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of |

| GALATIANS. | ROMANS. |
| --- | --- |
| | God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, &c. |
| iv. 28.—Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise. | ix. 7.—In Isaac shall thy seed be called. |
| v. 14.—All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. | xiii. 8-10.—He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law . . . and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself . . . love is the fulfilment of the law. |
| v. 16.—Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. | viii. 1.—Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. |
| v. 17.—For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. | vii. 13-25.—With the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. |
| vi. 2.—Bear ye one another's burdens. | vii. 15.—What I would, that I do not, but what I hate, that I do.<br>xv. 1.—We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. |

In addition to these coincidences of thought and expression, a number of words are peculiar to both Pauline epistles.[1]

We attach considerable weight to a parallelism so striking. Taking into consideration the similarity between the epistles to the Corinthians, especially the second, and the Galatian letter, with the more striking similarity of the latter to the epistle to the Romans, it is natural to place the Galatian letter between the two to the Corinthians and that addressed to the Romans; nearer the last than the former two, because of the greater affinity. The same leading ideas occupied the apostle's mind, and are expressed in similar diction. But the epistles themselves scarcely indicate the order in which those to the Romans and Galatians followed

[1] Βαστάζειν, δουλεία, ἐλευθεροῦν, ἴδε, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω, κῶμοι, μακαρισμός, μέθαι, οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες, ὀφειλέτης, παραβάτης, παρ' ὅ; τί ἔτι; τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;

one another. It is true that Bishop Lightfoot attempts to trace the order, first and second Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, in the history of Paul's personal sufferings, and in the progress of his controversy with the Judaising opponents,[1] but with precarious success ; for, according to Baur, the progress of the conflict with the Judaisers is supposed to have passed its first stage in the Corinthian epistles, where the opposition is of a different nature from that which is indicated in the Galatian epistle. The first ground of attack, circumcision, is abandoned ; and the adversaries at Corinth proceed more methodically and with greater reflectiveness, directing their attack against the apostle's person. This view is more plausible than Lightfoot's, and gives the order Galatians, Corinthians, Romans. But both methods of reasoning are precarious, especially the attempt to trace the sequence of the epistles by means of Paul's personal sufferings or feelings. The tactics of the Judaisers were different, in different places. Apart from all this, Paul's moods varied, not merely according to his personal sufferings of which we know little, or according to the opposition of Judaisers, but as the result of those innate promptings of which he was a sensitive subject, the passionate outbursts of sentiment, which took a general or specific shape without rule.

There is no good reason for dating the epistle prior to the first and second to the Corinthians. On the contrary, it should be nearer to the Roman letter, which was written at Corinth during Paul's three months' abode there. The same ideas are sketched in strong outline which the epistle to the Romans presents in a more systematic and polished form. The argument is the same ; the treatment different. This does not necessarily imply its priority, because the state of the churches, their relative importance, and the diversified operations of the Judaisers in them, might account for the dif-

[1] *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 50, *et seq.* 2nd ed.

ference. Hence we are not required to believe that the theme expanded in the apostle's mind with deliberation, till it swelled out into the great theological argument of the epistle to the Romans. Though briefer than the letter addressed to the church of the metropolis and less refined, the character of the persons may have caused all the difference. Yet it is probable that it preceded that to the Romans. An outline or sketch usually precedes a developed system. The rough draft of the great doctrine of justification by faith, presented in the Galatian epistle, is followed by the detailed description of it in the letter to the Romans.

We date the Galatian letter at Corinth prior to the Roman one, i.e. A.D. 58, according to the opinion of Grotius, Pearson, and others. The only objection to so late a date is the expression 'I marvel that ye are *so soon* changing,' &c., i.e. so soon after your conversion, whereas they had embraced Christianity six years before. But the phrase is comparative, depending on the measure of the person who uses it. It may refer to time measured by the importance of a thing; so that long and short vary according to the subjects about which they are employed. The Galatian apostasy was speedy, considering the labour bestowed on them by the apostle and their enthusiastic reception of his message.

The subscription, 'from Rome,' expresses a very ancient opinion, that of Theodoret and Jerome, of B**, K.P.L., and the two Syriac versions. ℵ, A., B*., C. have no place. The bearer of the letter is not known. Macknight fixes upon Titus, because as a Greek he was much interested in the doctrine established; and also because, being present at the Jerusalem council, he could attest what took place there. Perhaps Titus would have been mentioned had he been the bearer; for he was of more note than Tychicus, the bearer of the Colossian epistle.

## THE APOSTLE'S ADVERSARIES IN THE GALATIAN CHURCHES.

It is probable that a few emissaries had been sent into Galatia who began the strong Judaising tendency, and soon gained over converts that became influential Judaisers. One person, who was leader of the anti-pauline party, seems pointed at in v. 10, 'He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.'

It is difficult to tell who were the most active Judaisers among the Galatians themselves. They may have been recent converts among the Gentile Christians to the sentiments of the party which had its principal seat in Palestine. If this be so, they had been persuaded to associate Judaism with their simple Christianity, thinking both necessary to salvation. So Neander supposes, appealing to the passage in vi. 12, 13, 'As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law, but desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh.' The word translated 'they who are circumcised,'[1] may either be the present participle or the perfect passive. Lachmann prefers the latter. The former or received reading deserves the preference. Neander, who adopts it, appears to think it decisive *against* the assumption that the agitators were circumcised Jews and *for* the interpretation that they were Gentiles who suffered themselves to be circumcised. The expression seems to us equally applicable to converted Jews or proselytes.

Olshausen, again, supposes that the most influential seducers of the Galatian churches were Jews by birth,

[1] οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι or οἱ περιτετμημένοι (vi. 13).

who, after embracing Christianity, were easily induced to retain the essential part of their former faith.

A third opinion is, that they were proselytes from among the heathen to Judaism before Christianity had been planted in the country, and having embraced the gospel, united their former with their new faith.

We believe that they consisted not only of original members of the churches but of emissaries ; the latter being the chief promoters of the sudden change.

In prosecuting their design to bring the Galatians under the yoke of the law, the false teachers industriously circulated various calumnies against Paul. They attacked his apostleship, affirming that he had not been called immediately by Christ like the primitive apostles ; but that he received his commission from men. Neither had he been taught Christianity by the true apostles and therefore his knowledge was inferior to theirs. They asserted that, as Peter and his colleagues required the circumcision of Gentile converts, there was an inconsistency between them and Paul.

These Judaisers did not labour in vain. The fickle Galatians soon changed. Many submitted to circumcision and were ready to keep the Jewish feasts. Thus the aspect of their Christianity altered, and their religion became an external thing, to the destruction of faith and inward purity. The apostle refutes all such errors, justifying himself with triumphant success, and openly asserting the independence of his gospel. The refuge of lies to which his enemies had recourse is swept away with a torrent of argument which places his doctrine and conduct in the broad light of ingenuous truth.

The occasion of his writing is evident from these remarks. The apostasy of the converts, who had turned to the weak and beggarly elements of the law, was sufficient to call forth his reproofs. The fruit of his labours among them was being frustrated by injurious

influences that needed to be withstood. They had to be brought back, if possible, to the simple truth they had forsaken—to be taught again the first elements of Christianity, justification by faith without works.

### STATE OF THE CHURCHES WHEN VISITED BY PAUL A SECOND TIME.

The state of the Galatian churches at the time of Paul's second visit, compared with that in which he had left them, can scarcely be ascertained. He may have found everything encouraging, because they had remained steadfast in the faith; especially as the book of Acts says he *confirmed* the brethren, imprinting on their minds afresh the lessons he had taught before. But this cannot be a correct representation of their state. After his first visit, it is likely that the Judaisers were not idle. Attempts had been made, during his absence, to inculcate upon the converts the observance of the Mosaic law. The germ, at least, of the errors into which they afterwards fell, had appeared. The apostle had seen the leaven which had been fermenting in his absence; so that the state of the churches was neither sound nor satisfactory when he went a second time. Under the circumstances, he must have endeavoured to prevent the development of the principles which had taken root. Rebuking the perverse maxims of the false teachers, he exposed their corruption of the gospel, and put a stop for the time to the incipient apostasy of the converts. His presence allayed their doubts. But his reproofs, and earnest endeavours to eradicate the errors in question, had only a temporary effect. He had repressed without removing the evil; and it broke forth again in a more aggravated form.

This view is most consonant with such passages as i. 9; iv. 12, 18; v. 3–21, though they may also consist with the assumption, that no defection had taken

place at the time of his second visit. Yet it is difficult to believe, that the errorists did not make their appearance among the converts for about two or three years. It is not likely that they would be inactive there so long; or that their operations should not begin till after the apostle's second visit. In the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, it is natural to suppose that the Galatians had fallen away in the course of the first three years after their conversion. Bleek[1] assumes, that the apostle had just heard of the appearance of the Judaisers among the Galatians when he wrote, appealing to i. 6; iii. 1; v. 10; iv. 19, &c. If so, the parties had exercised no influence before Paul's second visit. But the passages are not decisive in favour of this opinion.

### COMPOSITION OF THE GALATIAN CHURCHES.

The mass of those to whom the epistle is addressed, were Gentile converts, as is plain from iv. 8: 'When ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.' Yet it is immediately added, that they turned again to the weak and beggarly elements of the law. Paul also employs arguments from the Old Testament and rabbinical modes of interpretation, involving an acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures on the part of his readers. Were the churches then divided between Jews and Gentiles, so that the writer turns from the one to the other as his argument leads? This can hardly be asserted in the face of iv. 8, 9, where the same persons in both verses are apparently Gentiles and Jews. No distinction is made between the case of the two classes respecting the obligation of circumcision, for it is said to all, 'if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.' It must therefore be assumed that the Galatians were Gentiles, who had been proselytes to

[1] *Einleitung in das neue Testament*, p. 419.

Judaism before their conversion by Paul. According to this supposition, which is that of Mynster, Credner, and Jowett, there is no difficulty in explaining the inconsistency in different passages of the epistle, which speak as if the Galatians were both Gentiles and Jews ; or in accounting for their relapse into Judaism. Jewish teachers, who were there before and after Paul, could easily persuade the converts of the necessity of circumcision. The churches in Galatia consisted mainly of those who had passed through a phase of Judaism. Jews by descent were fewer, while the smallest number consisted of those who turned directly from Paganism to Christianity. The habits, prejudices, and education of the converts, made it a difficult task to win them to a pure faith. The outward and sensuous had great attraction for them. Their nature was of the fickle, passionate, enthusiastic type which passes from one form of religion to another, without laying deep hold of truth. Its magical tendencies were more allied to bodily excision than to faith ; and a religion of the letter was adapted to their semi-barbarous state.

These observations preclude the necessity of examining the discordant views of those who hold that the Jewish element was in the Galatian churches at first, so that the minority at least were Jewish Christians while the majority were Gentiles ; and of those who think that the churches were originally Gentile, the Jewish element having come into them from without. The former accords best with the opinion that the Judaising direction had preceded the apostle's second visit. Others, however, suppose that the false teachers did not appear among the churches till after his second visit.

## AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the epistle has been admitted by all except Bruno Bauer, who imagines that it was compiled from those to the Romans and Corinthians. The contents and style bear the apostle's stamp.

Lardner and others have found allusions to it in the apostolic fathers. Clement of Rome writes: 'Christ our Lord gave his blood for us by the will of God, and his flesh for our flesh, and his spirit for our spirits' (Gal. i. 4).[1] This reference is doubtful. Ignatius says: 'Which bishop, I know, obtained the ministry for the public, not of himself, nor by men, nor out of vain glory, but by the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' (Gal. i. 1).[2] The allusion here is uncertain. Polycarp writes: 'Knowing, then, that "God is not mocked," we ought to walk worthy both of his command,' &c.[3] The epistle to Diognetus speaks of 'the observance of months and days' (Gal. iv. 10).[4]

The *Address to Greeks* incorrectly attributed to Justin Martyr, uses these words: 'Be as I am, for I was as ye are'[5] (Gal. iv. 12). Justin himself has no quotation from it. But he may have alluded to it where he quotes Deut. xxvii. 26, which he introduces, as Paul does, differently from the Greek and Hebrew.[6]

The first express testimony to the authenticity of the epistle, is given by fathers at the close of the second century and the first half of the third, by Irenæus,

[1] Τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.—*Ad Cor.* cap. 49.

[2] Ὃν ἐπίσκοπον ἔγνων, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπων κεκτῆσθαι τὴν διακονίαν, τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἀνήκουσαν . . . ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—*Ad Philad.* c. 1.

[3] Εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται, ὀφείλομεν ἀξίως τῆς ἐντολῆς κ.τ.λ. —*Ad Philipp.* c. 5.

[4] Bunsen's *Analecta Antenicæna*, vol. i. pp. 110, 111.

[5] γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ἤμην ὡς ὑμεῖς.—*Orat. ad Græcos*, c. 5.

[6] *Dial. cum Tryph.* ii. p. 345, ed. Thirlby.

Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. The first writes: 'The apostle says in the epistle to the Galatians: "Of what use, then, is the law of works? It was added until the seed should come to whom the promise was made,"' &c. (Gal. iii. 19).[1] Clement of Alexandria says: 'Wherefore Paul also, writing to the Galatians, says: "My children, of whom I travail again until,"' &c. (Gal. iv. 19).[2] Tertullian's testimony is to this effect: 'But no more need be said on this head, if it be the same Paul, who writing to the Galatians, reckons heresies among the works of the flesh,' &c.[3] The epistle is in the Peshito, the old Latin version, and the Muratorian canon.

The early heretics were also acquainted with the epistle, ascribing it to its true author. It was in Marcion's canon, though he is said to have omitted an important passage (iii. 6–9), and interpolated two words in another (ii. 5). Both charges are false, though Tertullian makes them.

Celsus says, that all the Christian sects, much as they may have hated one another, had perpetually in their mouths the words of Gal. vi. 14, 'The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' The Valentinians wished to prove, by the same passage, that Paul attributed to the cross the virtue which they did.[4]

## ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts: i. 1–ii. 21; iii. iv.; v. vi. The first is personal and apologetic;

[1] 'Sed et in ea quæ est ad Galatas sic ait (apostolus): "Quid ergo lex factorum? Posita est usque quo veniat semen cui promissum est,"' &c.—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 72, p. 365, ed. Migne.

[2] Διὸ καὶ Παῦλος Γαλάταις ἐπιστέλλων φησί· τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ.—*Stromata*, iii. p. 468, ed. Colon. 1688.

[3] 'Nec diutius de isto, si idem est Paulus, qui et alibi hæreses inter carnalia crimina numerat, scribens ad Galatas,' &c.—*De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 6.

[4] Origen *contra Celsum*, v. 64.

the second doctrinal, and the third practical. Each may be subdivided.

1. In maintaining the independent principle on which his apostolic calling rested, Paul states various particulars in his life. He begins with asserting that he was not made an apostle by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father. He then salutes the churches in Galatia, reproves the fickleness of the converts, expressing astonishment at the sudden change in their belief, pronounces a strong anathema on any who should preach another gospel, and declares, in opposition to the Judaisers, that his object was not to please men. The gospel he preached was not of human origin nor conformed to human wisdom; it was received by immediate revelation. The independence of his apostleship on the elder apostles he shows *negatively*, by stating that he was already an apostle before he came into contact with them. When God revealed his son in him, he did not consult with any man, nor go up to Jerusalem to learn of the twelve, but went into Arabia and did not visit Jerusalem till after three years; on which occasion he saw none of the apostles except Peter and James, and remained only fifteen days; too short a time to allow of his being instructed in Christian doctrine had he been previously ignorant of it. Still further, to prove that he had not been taught Christianity by the chief apostles, he asserts that he was a stranger to the Christians in Judea. The independence of his apostolic authority is also shown *positively* by his conceding nothing to the elder apostles when he came into contact with them, by the assertion of his rights and their recognition of them. On the occasion of his third journey to Jerusalem, he went with Barnabas and Titus, in consequence of an express revelation. Having explained his gospel to Peter, James, and John privately, they approved. He did not yield to the demand to circumcise Titus; and the twelve left him to follow his own course

without hindrance. The only thing proposed was, that collections should continue to be made in the churches for the use of the poor Christians in Judea (i.–ii. 10). In continuation of his argument respecting doctrinal independence, it is stated that he reprimanded Peter at Antioch, who through fear of the Judaisers acted so as to betray the liberty of Gentile converts. The substance of his language to Peter was—that even such as were born Jews believed in Jesus Christ for justification, since with all their attachment to the law, they knew that no man could be justified by works. The believer by means of the law becomes dead to it, that he may begin to live to God. He is crucified with Christ, and his life is a life of faith in the Son of God. The doctrine of justification by faith, so far from annulling the grace of God, establishes its necessity; but if justification be by the law, Christ died in vain (ii. 11–21).

2. The position thus laid down, viz. that it is faith in Christ which justifies, not works of the law, is shown to be a fact of Christian consciousness, and also a truth inherent in the Old Testament, inasmuch as the substance of the old dispensation is the promise made to Abraham; the law being essentially nothing but an appendix to that promise. The apostle appeals with confidence to the Galatians themselves, asking whether they had received the spirit by the law or the gospel. Beginning in the spirit, were they making an end in the flesh? Abraham himself was justified by faith not by the law; and righteousness belongs to all who by faith are his spiritual children. The law pronounces condemnation on all because it requires absolute obedience, which none can render. Christ in dying delivered men from the curse of the law, that the blessing promised to Abraham might come upon the Gentiles—the blessing of the promised spirit (iii. 1–14). The writer proceeds to explain the essence of the law, in which he shows its subordination to the promise, and the relative

significance which it has in its intermediate position between the promise and faith. If a human covenant cannot be broken, much less can God's promise made to Abraham and his seed. The law intervening between the promise and its fulfilment, could not prevent the latter. If it be asked, Of what use then is the law?—the answer is, it was added to convince of sin till the promised seed should come; but it was firmly established by angels not by God himself, and had a mediator. Now a mediator implies two persons, but there is no mediation in God: one is better than two: the dispensation of mediation or the law is inferior to the promise of faith or the gospel.[1] This does not imply that the law is opposed to the gospel; it was rather intended to prepare the way for it. It was a tutor leading men to Christ that they might be justified by faith. Under the gospel all are the sons of God by faith. There is no distinction between Jew and Greek. All are bound together in spiritual unity (iii. 15–29). Prior to the gospel both Jews and Gentiles were in bondage; but now God has sent his Son to deliver such as were under the dominion of an outward religion that they might be adopted as sons. As a proof of this He has given them the spirit of his Son; so that they are no longer in a state of bondage but heirs of God. He reminds the Galatians of their former idolatrous state, and of their present one, in which it would be preposterous for them to turn back to the weak and beggarly elements of Judaism. A sort of parenthetic or abrupt passage is thrown in here, expressing the painful feelings of the writer, his dejection and anger (iv. 13–20).

Speaking of himself, he exhorts them to be of the same mind with him. He is not referring to personal wrongs; they had shown great attachment to him. Weak and sickly as he was, they received him as an

[1] See the ingenious explanation of iii. 19–25 by Lüdemann, in his *Anthropologie des apostels Paulus*, pp. 179, 180.

angel of God. Was it possible that they could have become enemies, because he told them the truth? The Judaisers desired to make proselytes of them, but their motives were bad, since they wished to shut them out from Christ. He remarks that zealous affection is a good principle in a good cause; a principle which should be continued in his absence as well as presence; expresses his great solicitude about them till they should be spiritually restored, and then changes his style. After the fragmentary passage noticed, he reverts to the Old Testament to show them that they did not rightly understand the law, and allegorises the two covenants. Sarah, Abraham's wife, with her son Isaac, represents the New Testament church, which is free; Hagar, the bondwoman, with her son Ishmael, represents the Old Testament church. The latter must give place to the former. The law and the gospel are paralleled with the two children of Abraham (iii. iv.).

3. The practical part of the epistle begins with the fifth chapter.

The Galatians should remember their freedom under the new economy, and not allow themselves to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage. He warns them against circumcision, declaring that if they submitted to it Christ would be of no avail to them, because the circumcised virtually engage to keep the whole law. Under the gospel circumcision and uncircumcision are alike valueless; nothing but faith working by love avails. The Galatians had made a good beginning; but they were not now what they once were. They had been drawn away by the leaven of false teachers. Still he expresses a hope that they would not abandon themselves to errorists. As for himself, if he preached circumcision as he had been accused of doing, there could be no reason for the Jews persecuting him. In that case, they had no more to say against him. But the fact that he was still an object of persecution suffi-

ciently attests that he preached Christ's cross. In irony he adds, Would that they who trouble you would make themselves eunuchs, incapable of the privilege of circumcision!

While adhering to the liberty of the gospel, Paul exhorts them not to abuse it. They were bound to love one another, and so to fulfil the law. By leading a life of conformity to the will of God, they would take the most effectual method to suppress the sensual nature within them, and be released from the law as a system of outward observances. He then enumerates the works of the flesh and the fruit of the spirit, reminding them that Christ's true disciples have crucified their sinful nature and walk in the freedom of the divine life. Among various exhortations he recommends generosity to their instructors. Their duty was to do good to all men, especially to fellow-Christians.

After saying that he was writing the epistle in large letters with his own hand, his anxiety for the Galatians breaks forth again, and he repeats in brief the substance of the whole. He tells them that the Judaisers, wishing to have some outward thing to glory in, insisted on having them circumcised, only that they might not be persecuted because of the cross of Christ. They were inconsistent in observing some usages of the law and abandoning others; wishing to glory in Jewish ordinances, while Paul gloried in the cross of Christ. Pronouncing peace on such as walked by the rule of the new creature, he desires in conclusion, that the Galatians should give him no further trouble, since he carried about in his person the marks of sufferings endured for Christ. The letter closes with the usual benediction (v. vi.).

Contrary to usage, the apostle wrote the epistle with his own hand, in characters large and ill-shaped. The reason of his writing it himself was not to prevent forgery, as Olshausen thinks, but to prove the extent

of his affection, because the false teachers had endeavoured to alienate the Galatians from his person.

### RELATION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ACTS.

The Pauline authorship of the epistle has an important bearing on the Acts of the Apostles. It presents Paul in a different light from the historian's—so different as to cast grave suspicions on the accuracy of the portrait in the Acts. The Paul of the epistle is not the Paul of Luke. The apostle of the Acts is an observer of the law, like Peter, James, and John. He looks upon circumcision leniently, allowing it under the gospel; in the epistle, he opposes it as contrary to the genius of the gospel. It is possible to exaggerate the differences between the history and the epistle, in their portraiture of Paul; but after all reasonable deduction, enough remains to show that he is not the same man in both. There is a general discrepancy, with minor points of agreement—a variation of opinion and feeling that does injury to the apostle's character. His conceptions of Christianity were clear and decided, when he wrote the group of epistles, comprising those to the Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians; they were hardly the same when he appears in the Acts.

The relation between Paul and the original apostles is also presented differently in the two works. In the epistle, the doctrinal antagonism between the apostle of the Gentiles and the twelve, is too palpable to be denied. They are men in the first phase of Christianity—Judaic Christians with narrow conceptions; in the Acts they are more liberal, allowing Gentile Christians exemption from the law of Moses. In the epistle the relations between them and Paul are not harmonious. An uncompromising advocate of a free Christianity and the abrogation of the law, had little sympathy with their views. In the Acts there is a better understanding between the parties; and their points of antagonism are softened.

To reconcile these differences apologists have made a few unimportant concessions. But it is necessary to keep in view that Petrine Christianity was the first stage through which the new religion passed after its development out of Judaism; and Pauline Christianity was more comprehensive and freer. The essential point between them was the observance or non-observance of the law—a principle of antagonism which had to be broken down. The manner in which Paul speaks of Peter, James, and John, in the Galatian epistle, is not cordial but depreciatory: 'Those who seemed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me,' &c.). This language is depreciatory of the twelve themselves, not of the extravagant claims set up for them by the Judaisers. Does not the apostle speak of a different gospel of the circumcision and uncircumcision (ii. 2, 7); and of an opposition between himself and the twelve (*contrariwise*, verse 7), which implied at least, that they left him to fight his own battle without help? Great as was their authority, they did not assist him, but continued to preach the gospel of the circumcision.

The statements which the apostle makes about himself immediately after his conversion, do not agree with those of the Acts. So far from supplementing they mutually exclude one another. Expositors have tried to weave them into a consistent narrative, without success. The epistle gives the reader to understand that the apostle's immediate mission was to the Gentiles: 'to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the heathen' (i. 16); but in the Acts, he preached at once to the Jews in the Damascene synagogues, and after that to those at Jerusalem (ix. 19–29).

The Acts say that after 'many days' spent in Damascus, during which he preached in the synagogues, he was compelled to flee to Jerusalem, where he was looked upon with suspicion by the believers till Barna-

bas vouched for his sincerity and introduced him to the apostles; so that he was supported in his preaching there, till the Jews compelled his departure and removal to Tarsus (ix. 19, &c.). The epistle says, that immediately after his conversion he went to Arabia, returned thence to Damascus, and only visited Jerusalem after three years. There is no mention of the Arabian visit in the Acts; nor is there any room for its insertion. As to the stay in Jerusalem, the Acts represent it as of some length, and imply that he preached the gospel there. 'He was with them (the apostles) coming in and going out, and he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus' (ix. 28, 29). The object of his visit as given in the epistle was different, and his stay shorter. It was to see Peter, with whom he abode but fifteen days; neither did he see any other apostle there except James. He did not go therefore to preach the gospel, but simply to confer with Peter. It was about this time that the Acts speak of him as having shewed 'unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and *throughout all the coasts of Judea*,' that they should turn and repent (xxvi. 20); language which is contrary to his own statement that he was unknown by face long after to the churches of Judea in Christ (Gal. i. 22). The epistle demonstrates with sufficient clearness, that Paul did not preach to the Damascene Jews immediately on his conversion; that he did not go to Jerusalem after he had to leave Damascus; that he was not introduced there to the apostles by Barnabas; that the Jews in the metropolis did not seek to kill him; and that he did not go from Palestine to Tarsus; but the opposite to all this is given in the Acts. The writer of the Acts may not have known the epistle, as some critics suppose; yet that circumstance does not account for the discrepancies in question. His leading motive induced him to describe Paul, not as the uncompromising preacher of the gospel to the Gentiles from the first, but as one

who laboured to accommodate his teaching to the Jews, till he was reluctantly forced to turn to the Gentiles. The subject will occupy us again, when we come to examine the Acts of the Apostles.[1]

## INTERPRETATION.

The points of resemblance and difference between the epistles to the Galatians and Romans are admirably drawn out by Jowett. Both set forth the doctrine of justification by faith; the universality of the gospel which makes no distinction between Jew or Greek, bond or free; the nature of sin as transgression of the law and the spiritual union of the believer with Christ. They mention the observance of days and months, which is treated in the one as indifferent, in the other as hurtful; contain exhortations against antinomianism; the sonship of the gospel contrasted with the bondage of the Jewish economy; and a summary of works of the flesh. The differences are these: the epistle to the Galatians is more personal; that to the Romans resembles a treatise rather than a letter. The one treats circumcision as a question of practice; the other of the law as a burden on the heart and conscience. The argument of the one is fragmentary; that of the other comprehensive and continuous, extending over all mankind and all time. The epistle to the Galatians is an argument or expostulation with Judaising opponents; that to the Romans is an argument or dialogue with self, in which the opponent is only a shadow or idea, 'the old man' of the apostle's own thoughts, not the Jewish Christian with whom he is in actual conflict.

It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the term *law* as used in the epistles has a comprehensive sense, embracing the moral and the ceremonial. Both indeed are

[1] See Part I. of the English *Life of Jesus*, p. xv. etc.

united, being but different forms of law, a finer and a grosser. The one or the other is prominent according to the context, and they were evidently undistinguished in the apostle's thoughts. He excludes every form of law from an inherent efficacy to impart salvation, whether in the shape of ceremonial observances or deeds of sanctity or refined morality. Salvation is by faith in Christ not by works of law. Faith justifies because it rests upon one who satisfied divine justice and fulfilled the claims of law, so that God looking upon the believer as one with Christ, imputes the righteousness of the head to the members of the spiritual body. Justification is God's act, a forensic thing external to the believer, followed by a subjective change in the latter. This is the way in which Paul thought out the subject. But a more rational one may be given. In justification man becomes just and holy, that is, is raised up to a new life, because he believes that God is his loving Father in Christ Jesus, and acts accordingly. Works cannot be separated from faith. Indeed faith itself is in one sense a work—an exercise of the soul belonging to man himself, the rational act of a rational creature, as Baxter correctly thought. Salvation is of grace; yet man works out his salvation. In other words, God loves his creatures, and has made provision for their redemption; man believes this, and shows his love to God by acting agreeably to His will. There are degrees of faith and love, that is, men are in a saved or justified state, variously. To draw a line between the saved and not saved is impossible. The classes of good and bad run into one another; so that God alone, whose judgments are pervaded by perfect love and justice, can distinguish them.

'Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was

born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband' (iv. 21–27).

This passage has an important bearing on the hermeneutics of the apostle Paul. That he sometimes adopted the rabbinical mode of interpretation cannot be questioned. He allegorises the Old Testament history, as the Jews of his time were wont to do. What is meant by *allegorising* it? The following remarks will suffice for answer.

1. Bishop Marsh argues[1] that Paul does not pronounce the history itself an allegory, but merely declares it *allegorised*. It is one thing to say that a history is allegorised; it is another to say that it is allegory itself. Had the apostle meant that the history was an allegory, he need not have allegorised it. Paul *treats* the portion of history as an allegory, but does not thereby *convert* it into an allegory. He institutes the same comparison which we institute in an allegory; but the subjects of the comparison do not acquire the same character with the subjects of an allegory. This reasoning is followed by Palfrey, who bluntly says that the rendering, 'which things are an allegory,' 'represents Paul as saying precisely what he did not mean to say.'[2] The argument is ingenious but nugatory, the common rendering being as good as the proposed one.

[1] *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*, p. 354, *et seq.* ed. 1828.

[2] *The Relation between Judaism and Christianity*, p. 287.

There is no real difference between the two versions; nor did the apostle make linguistic distinctions, as suggested. He had not 'infidels' in view; and was not therefore obliged to tax his ingenuity.

2. Scripture history may be interpreted allegorically in two ways. It may be used typically, in which case the historical sense is preserved; or it may be employed in the genuine allegorical sense, excluding every other. Tholuck[1] argues that the apostle has applied here a typical sense, preserving the historical one. It is of little importance whether *allegorised* means *applied as types*, or not; the real question is, Was the typical or allegorical sense intended by the writers of the Old Testament themselves? A typical sense may be as fanciful as an allegorical one. It is an axiom of interpretation, that no passage has more than one sense. If so, the typical sense is an imaginary one—a mere application of history to something which the original writer did not think of. We hold that the apostle has given a mystical meaning to the narrative of Abraham and his two sons, agreeably to the Jewish mode of allegorising. As a specimen of interpretation, this is fanciful and incorrect; but it suited his purpose and readers. Ishmael had nothing to do with the law; and it is arbitrary to bring him as well as Isaac into connection with it. To the apostle's mind objective and subjective were one. He treated the history as pure allegory without an objective basis. Such exegesis was not peculiar to him. It was that of his time and contemporaries. The typical sense in which he understood the narrative did not conserve another; it was the only one, according to the apostle; who looked upon the symbolical representation as the conveyancer of abstract truth, not of historical facts.

In making these remarks, we do not deny that deeper meanings may lie hid under the Old Testament history,

[1] *Das alte Testament im neuen Testament*, p. 87, *et seq.*

still less that Paul may be right, though the Jews were wrong, in allegorising. All that is asserted is, that *the present* passage is an example of arbitrary type. Into the wide question whether the Old Testament dispensation was a system of typical events and ordinances, we do not enter. Whatever answer be given to it, one thing cannot be denied, that fanciful interpretations of the Old Testament are met with in the New ; that senses never meant by the original writers are given ; and that the true meaning is occasionally misapprehended, or excluded by another. In such instances, it is not necessary to affirm that the writers give wrong senses ; their interpretations have all the authority which the usage of the time gave them.

Apologists try to blunt the edge of these facts in their bearing on the nature of the writer's inspiration by saying, that allegorical interpretations are used as *illustrations* rather than arguments ; forgetting that with Paul, there is no difference between the two. It is idle to descant on the alleged dogmatism which is said to set up the intellectual standard of our age as an infallible rule ; for we measure the logic of the apostle by acknowledged axioms of interpretation. Philosophy and exegesis are capable of judging allegory rightly, without claiming infallibility ; and it is only the men who maintain a plenary inspiration for the sacred authors—an infallibility which the authors themselves never claim—that conceal their imperfect reasonings.

Our observations will be confirmed by another passage in the epistle (iii. 16), which runs thus :—

'Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many ; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.'

After saying that the promise was made to Abraham and his seed, an explanatory gloss is subjoined to strengthen the argument. Paul states that the words of the Old Testament were, 'to thy seed,' limiting the

noun to one person, i.e. Christ, by using the singular not the plural number. The reasoning turns on the number of the noun, from which it has been concluded that the apostle believed in the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament. The plural of the Hebrew word, here rendered by a corresponding Greek one, could not have been used, because it only means 'crops of grain.' Hence it is superfluous to say that he did not employ the plural. Besides, the Hebrew word *seed*, and its Greek representative,[1] are collective in the singular, denoting *race* or *posterity*; whereas *seed* is limited by the apostle to one person, i.e. Christ. Here we have a rabbinical exposition. The Jews sometimes pressed the singular or plural in this fashion; and explained *the seed* in Gen. iv. 25, of Messiah. The error, though a grammatical one, affects the theological interpretation. The seed of Abraham meant nothing else than the Jewish people; and to give it another sense is contrary to exegesis. There is no secondary or typical sense apart from the historical one. If such be assumed, it is independent of the latter and rests on an imaginary basis. If it be evolved out of the latter, it is only by a spiritualising process that supersedes that which gives it birth. Allegorical interpretation sets aside the legitimate sense. In the present instance, *the seed of Abraham* assumes a meaning which springs out of the rabbinical education of the apostle. If any wish to see the efforts of an overstrained anxiety to defend this apostolic *midrash*, let him read Tholuck's remarks. Apologists fall into palpable blunders in upholding the accuracy of a rabbinical comment, and assert that his argument is independent of his philology, when the argument *turns upon* the philology, since the author infers that Christ alone is meant because the singular number of the noun *seed* is used. Grammar and philology control exposition. Theological, resolves itself into grammatical, interpretation.

[1] σπέρμα, זֶרַע.

# THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

## ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

THE time at which the seed of the gospel was carried to Rome is unknown. That it had taken root there during the life of Christ is an idea which cannot be entertained, though it is sanctioned by the Clementine homilies. The Jewish population of the city was considerable in the time of the apostles ; as we learn from Philo, Josephus, Dion Cassius, and others. When Pompey the Great conquered Judea, he sent large numbers of the inhabitants as prisoners to Rome to be sold for slaves. Under Augustus, the friend of Herod the Great, many of them were liberated and made Roman citizens, having a dwelling-place assigned them beyond the Tiber. The young colony rapidly increased under the fostering influence of the emperor ; for Josephus states that more than 8,000 belonging to Rome joined an embassy of fifty deputies from Judea to second a petition to Augustus.[1] But they did not enjoy constant favour, since Sejanus had 4,000 transported to Sardinia ; and the remainder were ordered to depart from Italy on a certain day, unless they renounced their religion.[2] With the fall of Sejanus the edict lost its significance ; and imperial favour returned to the Jews. In like manner Claudius banished them from Rome, A.D. 49 or 50 ; but many must have re-

[1] *Antiq.* XVII. ii. 1.

[2] Tacit. *Annal.* ii. 85.

67919

turned soon after. Dion Cassius testifies that Judaism continued to increase at Rome, in spite of all the restrictions and decrees issued against it.[1]

Were there Christians at Rome when Claudius's decree against the Jews was issued? This point cannot be determined for want of definite historical testimony. The language of a passage in Suetonius bearing upon it is ambiguous. The emperor, it is said, 'banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually raising tumults, at the instigation of Chrestus.'[2] If these words refer to disputes between Jews and Christians, Christianity had already found its way into the Roman synagogue. The Romans mispronounced the name *Christus*, taking it to be the same as *Chrestus*, a Greek word; and therefore Suetonius may have meant Jesus Christ. It is likely that the words of the Roman historian involve the existence of Christians at Rome in the time of Claudius. The preaching of Christ in the Roman synagogues was a constant source of disturbance, and led to the banishment of the Jews from the city.

A passage in the Acts respecting Aquila and Priscilla is also indefinite in its bearing on the point. 'And found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome), and came unto them' (xviii. 2). Some may suppose that Aquila was still a Jew, because he is so called, without a word to indicate his faith in Christianity. But Jewish Christians are styled so in Acts xxi. 39; xxii. 3. Nothing prevents the supposition that Aquila is called a Jew even after he had embraced Christianity, in order to distinguish his nation. If Aquila and Priscilla were already Christians, we can explain why Paul attached himself to them so soon. Similarity in faith and in occupation drew him to their abode rather than to that of other tent-makers at

[1] *Histor.* xxxvii. 17. [2] Claud. chap. xxv.

Corinth. It is possible that he may have become a convert after leaving Rome, and before arriving at Corinth, but it is not probable; and if he first made a profession of Christianity at the latter city, his altered sentiments were the result of Paul's teaching. On the whole, it is probable that Aquila and Priscilla were Christians before leaving Rome; though the language of Acts xviii. 2 is not decisive in regard to it. The fact of their Christianity before Claudius's decree is not inconsistent with its being directed against the Jews, because the Romans did not distinguish between Jews and Jewish Christians; their laws making no separation between the two religions. We agree with those who assume the existence of Christians at Rome when Claudius's edict was issued; and reckon Aquila with his wife among the number. How long they were such cannot be known. It has been conjectured that Jews from Rome who were present at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, returned home with the seed of the new religion (Acts ii. 10); and that Jewish Christians, scattered abroad by the persecution arising after Stephen's death, may have found their way to the metropolis. The extraordinary influx of foreigners from all parts of the empire furnishes ground for believing that the gospel took early root in the imperial city. The constant intercourse between it and the provinces might make many acquainted with the new religion whose converts became so numerous.

The Roman Catholic Church asserts that Peter was the founder and first bishop of the Christian community at Rome. The earliest documents which speak of him in Rome (or Babylon) are the first epistle of Peter, and the Clementine homilies, both composed in the last half of the second century. The latter work, written in the interest of Petrine as opposed to Pauline Christianity, makes him follow Simon Magus to Rome. The original sense of this Ebionite tradition was afterwards for-

gotten ; Simon being retained only as an arch-heretic, the father of all Gnostics. The Catholic Church, looking for its basis in Peter and Paul, made both apostles live and work together in Rome for several years. Justin Martyr places the arrival of Simon in Rome under Claudius ; and as Paul came in the reign of Nero, it was necessary to bring down Peter's arrival in Rome to the time of Nero, for the purpose of having the two in friendly co-operation. The harmonising of the discordant accounts was effected in different ways, which are seen in the work called the 'Preaching of Peter' and in the 'Acts of Peter and Paul,' both Catholic productions of the second century. The same conciliatory tendency presents itself in the writings of the early fathers, all of whom entertained the idea of one Catholic Church founded by the two prominent apostles, who represented the primitive and posterior forms of Christianity. It was natural that the true sense of the earliest tradition about Peter's antagonism to Paul, which appears in the Clementine homilies, should be supplanted by one originating in the interest of a newly developing Catholic church.[1]

According to Dionysius of Corinth, in his epistle to the Corinthians, as Eusebius records, Peter and Paul were associated in founding the Roman church ;[2] which agrees with Irenæus's testimony.[3] Clement of Alexandria says, that the apostle Peter came to Rome in the reign of Claudius to confront Simon Magus ;[4] with which agrees Eusebius's statement that he founded the church in the first year of Claudius (A.D. 41 or 42).[5] This early creation of Peter's apostolic agency at Rome was necessary for a twenty-five years' episcopate.[6] The Liberian catalogue of Popes of the

[1] See Lipsius's *Die Quellen der Römischen Petrussage*, 1872.
[2] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 14.
[3] *Chron.* lib. ii.—*Opp.* vol. i. p. 539, ed. Migne.
[4] *De Script. Eccles.* c. i.
[5] *H. E.* ii. 25.
[6] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8.

year 354, founded on the older chronicle of Hippolytus till 234, makes Peter Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, one month, and nine days. Hence Jerome states that he governed the church for twenty-five years; and the belief became common.

These patristic statements are refuted by the New Testament; for—

(*a.*) Peter was still at Jerusalem when the so-called apostolic council was held there, about the twelfth year of Claudius's reign.

(*b.*) In speaking of Paul's coming to Rome, the writer of the Acts never alludes to Peter, nor intimates that the church had such a founder. *The brethren* met him, and he spent two years with them. Is not this silence unfavourable to the opinion either that Peter had been or was there at the time?

(*c.*) The epistles supposed to be written by Paul during his imprisonment make no allusion to Peter. Neither does the latter send any salutation to the readers of those epistles. Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus are declared to be Paul's only fellow-workers in the kingdom of God (Coloss. iv. 11). Epaphras, Luke, and the saints of Cæsar's household are also mentioned. It is impossible that Peter could have been overlooked in the epistles, if he was at Rome when they were written, especially as the salutations of inferior persons are noticed; and it is most improbable that he had been there before, since there is no hint of previous residence.

(*d.*) Had the Roman believers enjoyed the teaching or episcopal superintendence of Peter, Paul, who declares that he had striven to preach the gospel where it had not been heard before, lest he should build on another's foundation, would not have been anxious to visit and instruct them.

(*e.*) The epistle contains no salutation to Peter, and therefore he was not at Rome when it was written.

These considerations disprove the ancient tradition

that Peter was at Rome either in Claudius's reign, or before the writing of the letter.

Learned members of the Roman Catholic Church have not all adopted the tradition in question; for Feilmoser concludes that Peter could not have been in the imperial city sooner than a year before his death.[1]

It follows from these remarks, that Christianity was introduced into Rome as early at least as the middle of the first century, and that the original converts were Jewish Christians. The name of Jesus was first heard in the synagogue, and the church at its commencement was a Jewish Christian one. Heathenism had ceased to satisfy reflecting pagans, who longed for a purer worship and turned to the Jewish religion, so that according to Seneca, in a fragment preserved by Augustine,[2] the conquered gave laws to the conquerors. Juvenal too, in his sixth satire, ridicules the Jew-loving Romans.

### COMPOSITION OF THE CHURCH WHEN THE APOSTLE WROTE.

Though the tradition of Peter's founding the church is unhistorical, a fact lies at the root of it, viz. that the church was originally Petrine or Jewish Christian. But during the eight or nine years of its existence till Paul's letter was written, a change may have passed over it. Gentiles may have associated themselves with it in such numbers as to exceed the primitive class and give it another character. Converts from Gentilism may have altered the prevailing type into a Gentile-Christian one. It is assumed that the edict of Claudius had the effect of separating the Roman Christians as much as possible from all connection with the unbelieving synagogue, in order to escape the consequences of it. But this and similar assumptions about

[1] *Einleitung*, p. 106, *et seq.* [2] *De Civitate Dei*, lib. vii. c. 11.

the decree of the Emperor are precarious. It is improbable that all the Jewish Christians were expelled along with every Jew in Rome, leaving the church there to consist of converts from heathenism only. The mildness and humanity of Nero in the first five years of his reign would allow the mass of the expelled to return and resume their place in the community as Christians. But all reasoning about the changed relations of the Roman church in the interval between its founding and the receipt of the apostle's letter has no proper basis. The relative proportion of Jewish and Gentile converts can only be settled by the epistle itself.

The constitution of the church when the apostle wrote is a subject of debate. The most probable opinion is that the Jewish Christian element largely preponderated; though a contrary view is held by Hofmann, Tholuck, and Philippi. The church seems to have been large. Paul says, at least, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. It is not necessary to assign a reason for the apostle omitting to mention elders and deacons. Perhaps these officers were not then among them; or the writer's want of knowledge may account for his silence. We cannot tell whether there was a regularly organised church; whether the believers met in one place; or whether they gathered in separate localities. It is probable, however, that there was no definite organisation; and that the believers met in different places; in the house of Aquila and elsewhere. Whatever unity of belief and feeling existed among them, their outward organisation showed little compactness. The term *church* is not applied to them, nor are *bishops and deacons* spoken of, as in the Philippian epistle. But it is unsafe to argue from the absence of these expressions, respecting the existence or non-existence of a *formal church*. Nor can xiii. 11 be built upon in relation to the point, though Ewald thinks it may. Whatever may have been their

external arrangements, the mutual spirit of the believers was not a model of love, if Jewish and Gentile Christians formed distinct portions of the one community; for the narrowness of the one prevented cordial sympathy with the other.

How far the apostle was aware of their exact state is a question that cannot be answered. He had doubtless received accounts from converts who visited him in Greece and elsewhere; but his knowledge must have been general, unless there was frequent intercourse between him and Christians in the metropolis.

No light can be thrown upon the state of the church at Rome when the apostle wrote, by the conclusion of the Acts where his personal arrival in the city is mentioned, because that narrative is unhistorical. How could the leaders of the Jews be so ignorant of Christianity, when a numerous church existed near them with many Jewish converts belonging to it? The community was not so insignificant as to elude their observation or excite their contempt. The Jews and Christians of the metropolis were too much identified in opposition to heathenism not to know one another. The epistle itself affords the only means of ascertaining the actual composition of the community, whether it was more Jewish or Gentile. That the mass of believers consisted of Gentile Christians has been inferred from several passages, chiefly the following:—

'By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among *all nations* for his name, *among whom* are ye also the called of Jesus Christ' (i. 5, 6). Here the word rendered *nations* means Gentiles generally; and though it might be said of born Jews that they lived among the heathen at Rome, it is more agreeable to the language of the apostle to understand him as saying that his readers were a part of the heathen to whom his apostleship referred.

'Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that

oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but was let hitherto), that I might have some fruit among you also, *even as among other Gentiles*' (i. 13). These words are more exact than the last in affirming that the community was a Gentile one, composed of converts from heathenism. Mangold errs in confining the fruit which Paul wished to gather among them to the converting of Gentiles in Rome;[1] it refers to activity among Roman Christians already converted.

A third place, on which Tholuck[2] lays considerable stress, is in the 15th chapter. 'Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you, in some sort as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost' (xv. 15, 16). Here Paul announces himself the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable to God. But the context does not necessarily limit the *offering of the Gentiles* to that of the *Roman Christians*.

Other passages, such as xi. 13, 17–24, 28, 30, where the writer turns to the Gentile Roman Christians, are consistent with the assumption that the majority of the church was Jewish. Indeed the words of xi. 13, 'I speak to you Gentiles,' imply that they were a minority. The reasoning of the apostle throughout the epistle supposes Jewish readers acquainted with the law. This is conspicuous in chaps. ix.–xi., in ii.–iv., and elsewhere. The general argument is unintelligible or at least irrelevant, without an implied relation to Jewish modes of thought. How then are we to reconcile the two conflicting phenomena? How bring together the plain statements in i. 13, where the Roman Christians are

[1] *Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der Römischen Gemeinde*, p. 82.
[2] *Commentar zum Briefe Pauli an die Römer*, Einleit. § 2.

called *Gentiles*, and in vii. 1, where the writer speaks to them 'that know the law'? The explanation that the apostle turns to one class in the church in some parts of the epistle, and in other parts to another class, hardly meets the case. If we suppose with some critics, that the great majority of the church were Gentile Christians, the opinion does not harmonise with the general tone of the letter, or the knowledge of the law presupposed in the readers, unless those Gentile Christians were Jewish proselytes. And the testimony of a few passages is too plain to allow of the opinion that the church was for the most part Jewish Christian, unless that prevailing element in it consisted of native Jewish Christians and Jewish converts of Gentile extraction. Here is the solution of the difficulty proposed by Prof. Jowett. 'The Roman church appeared to be at once Jewish and Gentile; Jewish in feeling, Gentile in origin. Jewish, because the apostle everywhere argues with them as Jews; Gentile, because he expressly addresses them by name as such.'[1] This is scarcely correct. The centre of the church was Jewish, to which a Gentile growth was added. The mass consisted of Jewish Christians; but there was a considerable number of Gentiles. Whether the latter had passed through Judaism into Christianity, or directly from paganism to Christianity, cannot be ascertained. It will always be a debateable point whether the majority consisted of Jewish or Gentile Christians; there can be little doubt of the church's Jewish origin. We believe in the *predominance* of the Jewish Christian element, with a strong infusion of the Gentile Christian one. Beyschlag's plausible hypothesis that the church consisted of Jewish proselytes coincides with Jowett's; but we cannot agree with it. Some parts of the letter presuppose the existence of two parties, between whom there was a degree of jealousy.

[1] *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, &c.*, vol. ii. p. 23, 2nd ed.

The seeds of dissension lay in their doctrinal views. The Jew, after embracing Christianity, was still attached to the Mosaic law, and valued it too highly to renounce it at once. He sought salvation through Christ in connection with the rites in which he had been nurtured. The Gentile Christian, despising Jewish partiality to outward forms, presumed, in his sense of freedom, to do things likely to offend the conscience of his less enlightened brother. Thus there was a constant tendency to separation between the parties. The elements of strife appeared in the Roman church when Paul wrote his epistle, but were less visible and marked than in the Galatian congregations. Various allusions in the closing chapters imply the existence of Judaic prejudices. The admonitions addressed to the weak and the strong in the 14th chapter refer to Jewish and Gentile Christians respectively. To what extent alienation between them had proceeded it is difficult to tell; but it had produced no rupture. The parties were not yet strongly arrayed against one another. The pretensions of the Jewish Christians do not seem to have been arrogant against their Gentile brethren; but though no breach had been effected, the one had deep-rooted scruples about the admission of the Gentiles to the full privileges of God's people. The question of circumcision had not separated them. Still there was the Jewish tendency on one hand, and the free spirit on the other; the former, the more prominent and stronger. The apostle himself knew its stubbornness, for it lessened his authority and thwarted the genius of the gospel he preached. But he could treat it tenderly as well as firmly, because his love for his countrymen was strong, frequently bursting forth in the midst of anti-Judaic reasonings and moderating their vehemence. We see a constant conflict between his convictions and feelings: the former too deep to be changed, the latter too strong to be repressed, too ardent to be quenched even by opposition.

### THE APOSTLE'S OBJECT OR DESIGN IN WRITING.

The object of Paul in the present epistle may be represented in a light so general as either to exclude all references to the special relations of the church; or to reduce their intrinsic value to comparative insignificance. This has been done by such critics as Olshausen, who suppose that the writer intended to set forth the essential truths of the gospel in their adaptation to sinful humanity—to expound the plan of salvation as conferring equal blessings on all. According to the view in question, the cardinal doctrines of Christianity are inculcated in substance. The apostle's design was didactic and comprehensive, giving rise to an epistle of ampler range and profounder views than any other apostolic communication—to a doctrinal treatise rather than a letter. This view of the epistle is maintained by many good critics, including De Wette and Reiche. But though the ground taken by the writer is general like his commission, there is reason for doubting the correctness of the opinion. In all other instances, the epistles arose out of certain circumstances in the state of the parties addressed, and the connection between them and the writer. Nor should the present be made an exception, especially as the letter itself is not uncoloured by the condition and feelings of those to whom it is directed. Analogy is against a general didactic object. The letter was suggested by the relations of the Roman community itself. It originated in the circumstances of the church; and refers to the members of it more or less definitely. An object so general as that of an exposition of the gospel to the Roman converts, savours of modern theology, rather than of the first century in which Christianity was not only apprehended very differently by different parties, especially by Jewish and Gentile Christians, but taught by

apostles in a wider or narrower, a more liberal or more sectarian form, according to educational prepossessions or mental tendencies. Christian truth did not lie in the minds of the apostles as a complete whole which they had only to set forth in its absolute relations. It was progressively developed within them, becoming clearer to their consciousness according to subjective and objective conditions. They were men of a peculiar age, one characterised by rapid changes and revolutionary ideas. They were in the midst of moving events; extraordinary impulses without, and a divine spirit remarkably active, within. Hence they could not, like us moderns, give forth a wide scheme of doctrine, the result of calm reflection, as a perfect or complete synopsis for the future as well as the present. Their ideas were shaped by prevalent currents of thought, and came with the limitations created by local and temporary exigencies.

The purpose of the apostle was not so wide as the writing of a theological compendium for the use of the Roman Christians either alone or with others. Baur makes it polemic. Believing that the Jewish Christians formed the chief part of the Roman church and that an anti-Pauline tendency had begun to develop itself early among them, he supposes that they took offence at the ministry of Paul because they saw it effective in bringing constantly increasing numbers into the kingdom of Messiah, while Israel as a nation was excluded. They made objections, therefore, to the apostle's universalism. As long as the nation of Israel did not participate in the grace of the gospel, they regarded the reception of the Gentiles as an abridgment of their prerogatives—an injustice done to them—a barrier to the promises given to Jehovah's people. Asserting that Christian salvation has only a particular bearing, they thought that the bestowment of grace depended on national privileges. The epistle was written to meet

this state of feeling in the church; and is therefore a justification of Paul's apostleship, called forth by Jewish antagonism. No friendly circumstances gave rise to it. It grew out of unfavourable views in a church where the Gentile Christians were nothing compared with the Jewish believers. Hence the tone is polemic or at least apologetic.[1]

Agreeably to this hypothesis, Baur regards chapters ix.–xi. as the centre and nucleus of the entire epistle—the essential portion which gave occasion to the whole.

The opinion in question comes near the true view of the writer's object, but is hardly correct, because it implies too wide a separation between the Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Roman church; pushing the influence as well as the pretensions of the former to excess by reducing the latter to an insignificant minimum. It also overlooks some of the apostle's own declarations, especially those in the introduction to the letter (i. 1–17), and undervalues the first eight chapters.

We cannot accept the view, either as the critic sets it forth, or in the modified form which Mangold gives it.[2] The occasion of writing was the particular state of the church at Rome. Certain special injunctions were not suggested by the *possibility* of disturbing influences within the church, nor by what the apostle had encountered in Galatia and Corinth, but by existing facts. Yet the tendency and tone are general, because the apostle's design was to explain and justify the gospel of universalism which he preached to the heathen, rather than his own apostleship. By this means he met the scruples of the Jewish Christians respecting the admission of the Gentiles to the same privileges with the Jews, and showed the inability of the law to bestow a righteousness attainable through faith alone.

[1] *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, p. 341, *et seq.*

[2] *Der Romerbrief und die Anfänge der Römischen Gemeinde*, 1866.

The occasion was special; the object general. Hence the letter was not meant for a compendium of evangelical doctrine, or a system of dogmatic theology. Neither is it a general summary of what Paul had written before, or a combination of the fragmentary teaching contained in other letters. It was written to establish the validity of his mission by developing 'the righteousness of God' in connection with the cross of Christ. Through such doctrine he aims at forming the consciousness of the Jewish Christians into the belief in one appointed way of uniting man with God—one all-sufficient atonement effected by the sacrificial death of the Messiah fulfilling divine justice and introducing a new righteousness. The germs of ideas contained in preceding letters are fully developed. The apostle's tone is expository and indirectly polemic. The views of the Jewish Christians who formed the body of the church, their theocratic scruples respecting the Gentiles, their national prepossessions, are effectually combated, not by direct antagonism, but in the exposition and defence of the truth which he preached as the peculiar apostle of the Gentiles. Such procedure would further the spiritual life of the Christian body at Rome, and unite the parties in a common faith.

## TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

When the apostle wrote, he was about to go to Jerusalem to minister to the saints, with contributions from Macedonia and Achaia (xv. 25–27), which indicates his last abode in Achaia of three months' duration (Acts xx. 3). He intended to pass from Achaia to Syria, in order to get to Jerusalem directly; but was compelled by the machinations of the Jews to take another way, back through Macedonia. This alteration of plan had not been made when he wrote, else he would have noticed it. We infer, therefore, that the epistle was composed

before he set out again from Achaia. Corinth was the chief city; and we may fix upon it as the place of his three months' stay. That it was written there may be inferred from the fact, that Caius, an inhabitant of Corinth, sends a salutation to the Roman Christians. Erastus is also mentioned as steward of the city where the apostle wrote; and we learn from 2 Tim. iv. 20, that he dwelt at Corinth. Phœbe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, is also commended to the Romans; and Cenchrea was the port of Corinth. From the manner in which she is introduced to the favourable regard of the Roman Christians, it is conjectured that she was the bearer of the letter, either alone or with others. It should be remembered, however, that these indications of time and place are drawn from the 16th chapter, the authenticity of which is very questionable. The epistle was written A.D. 58.

### AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the epistle has been called in question by Evanson and Bruno Bauer, but is amply attested, both by the most ancient witnesses and internal evidence.

Clement of Rome writes: 'Casting off from us all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, debates, malignities and deceits, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and boasting, vain glory and ambition. For they that do such things are hateful to God; and not only they that do them, but they also who have pleasure in them.' (Compare Rom. i. 29–32.)[1] Compare also Rom. iii. 29 with ch. xxx.; xii. 5 with ch. xlvi.; xiv. 1 with ch. xxxviii.

[1] *ἀπορρίψαντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνομίαν, πλεονεξίαν, ἔρεις, κακοηθείας τε καὶ δόλους, ψιθυρισμούς τε καὶ καταλαλιάς, θεοστυγίαν, ὑπερηφανίαν τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν, κενοδοξίαν τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν. Ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες στυγητοὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν· οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες αὐτά, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες αὐτοῖς.*—1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. xxxv.

Polycarp has the following: 'And must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and every one give an account for himself' (Rom. xiv. 10).[1]

Theophilus of Antioch (180) says: 'To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for immortality, He will give eternal life, joy, peace, rest, and many good things, &c. . . . But to the unbelieving and the despisers, and them that obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness . . . . shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish' (compare Rom. ii. 6–9).[2] In another place, 'Honour to whom honour, fear to whom fear, tribute to whom tribute; to owe no man anything but only to love all men' (Rom. xiii. 7, 8).[3]

In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons (180), occurs the following quotation: 'Showing indeed that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us' (Rom. viii. 18).[4]

Irenæus is the first who expressly quotes the epistle as Paul's: 'This same thing Paul has explained, writing to the Romans: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, predestinated to the gospel of God, which He promised by his prophets," &c. And again, writing to the Romans, he says of Israel, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for evermore."'[5]

[1] *πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι.—Ad Philipp.* c. 6.

[2] *τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν διὰ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν ζητοῦσί τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, δωρήσεται ζωὴν αἰώνιον, χαράν, εἰρήνην, ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ πλήθη ἀγαθῶν . . . τοῖς δὲ ἀπίστοις καὶ καταφρονηταῖς, καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, . . . ἔσται ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός, θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρίαι.—Ad Autolyc.* lib. ii. p. 79, ed. Colon.

[3] *τῷ τὴν τιμήν, τὴν τιμήν· τῷ τὸν φόβον, τὸν φόβον· τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον· μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλειν ἢ μόνον τὸ ἀγαπᾶν πάντας.—Ad Autolyc.* lib. iii. p. 126.

[4] *ὄντως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς.—H. E.* v. i. p. 7, ed Heinichen.

[5] 'Hoc ipsum interpretatus est Paulus scribens ad Romanos: Paulus apostolus Jesu Christi, prædestinatus ad evangelium Dei, quod promisit

Clement of Alexandria says: 'Behold therefore, says Paul, the goodness and severity of God,' &c.[1] And in another place: 'In like manner Paul writes in the epistle to the Romans: "How shall we who have died to sin, live any longer in it?"'[2]

Tertullian says: 'But I will call Christ alone God, as the same apostle (Paul) does: of whom Christ came; who is, says he, God over all, blessed for ever.'[3]

The internal character of the epistle and its historical allusions coincide with the external evidence, in proving it an authentic production of the apostle. It bears the marks of his vigorous mind; the language and style being remarkably characteristic.

### INTEGRITY.

The authenticity of the doxology in xvi. 25–27 has been questioned.

The three verses are found at the end of the 16th chapter in ℵ, B., C., D., E., 16, 80, 137, 176, the *d. e. f.* of the old Latin, Peshito, Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic; in copies mentioned by Origen; in Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, and other Latin writers.

They are put at the end of the 14th chapter in L. and the great majority of cursive MSS., in most Greek lectionaries, the later Syriac, Armenian (in some MSS.), in copies mentioned by Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Theophylact, Œcumenius, &c.

per prophetas suos, etc. Et iterum ad Romanos scribens de Israel dicit, Quorum patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in secula.'—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 16. 3.

[1] Ἴδε οὖν, φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας, κ.τ.λ.—*Pædagog.* lib. i. p. 140, vol. i. ed. Potter.

[2] ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ γράφει· οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;—*Stromata*, lib. iii. c. ii. vol. i. p. 544, ed. Potter.

[3] 'Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere sicut idem apostolus: ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum amen.'—*Adv. Praxeam*, c. xiii.

They are found in both places in A., P., 5, 17, 109, lat. 37, and in MSS. of the Armenian version.

They are wanting in F., G., and in copies alluded to by Jerome. Marcion too had not the verses; but Origen states that he took away the last two chapters.[1] It has also been thought that Tertullian did not read the verses; an opinion which is more than doubtful, for his citing xiv. 10 as being in the closing part (clausula) of the epistle is sufficiently correct.[2]

The preponderance of external testimony is in favour of the authenticity, and of the position at xvi. 25–27.

Internal evidence leads another way, for—

1. A doxology at the end of an epistle is contrary to Paul's manner.

2. The epistle had been already completed at the 24th verse, 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen,' if that verse be authentic; if not, at the 20th verse.

3. It wants the simplicity of Paul's doxologies, being inflated, exaggerated, obscure, having irregular and awkward constructions. The combination of 'my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ' is un-Pauline and unsuitable. 'To stablish according to my gospel' yields no good sense, and is contrary to the usage of the verb in the New Testament with a preposition, viz. to *stablish in*.[3] And what is the meaning of establishing the Roman Christians, not only according to the gospel of the writer and the preaching of Jesus Christ, but also

[1] 'Caput hoc (xvi. 25–27) Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit. Et non solum hoc sed et ab eo ubi scriptum est: quod non ex fide est, peccatum est (xv. 23) usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in iis quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput (xvi. 25–27) diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus (xiv. 23) statim cohærens habetur: ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. Alii codices vero in fine continent.'—*Comment. ad Rom.* xvi. 25.

[2] *Adv. Marcion.* v. 13.

[3] στηρίζειν ἐν; compare 1 Thess. iii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17.

*according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began?* The construction of the relative pronoun '*to whom* be glory,' &c. is ambiguous.[1] If it be referred to *Jesus Christ* immediately preceding, the idea is contrary to Paul's usage, who never ascribes glory to the Son but to the Father. If it be referred to *the only wise God*, the doxology is left incomplete. The analogy of the same relative pronoun in Acts xxiv. 6, used irregularly, does not hold good, because Paul is not the writer there. Besides, the expression *by Jesus Christ*[2] is unintelligible here; and Meyer's explanation, 'to God, who appears as the only wise One through Jesus Christ,' is far-fetched. These are the phenomena in the three verses that strike the reader as peculiar. We admit that their tenor is Pauline, but that arises from the fact that the doxology is made up for the most part of expressions from the later Pauline literature. Thus, 'according to my gospel' is from Rom. ii. 16; 'the revelation of the mystery,' from Ephes. iii. 3; 'kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest,' is from 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; 'according to the commandment of the everlasting God,' from Titus i. 3; 'to all nations, for the obedience of faith,' from Rom. i. 5; 'by Jesus Christ,' from Rom. ii. 16; 'to the only wise God' is either from 1 Tim. i. 17, where, however, the adjective *wise* is spurious; or from Jude 25. The whole tone resembles in part the doxology in Heb. xiii. 20, 21;[3] and the phraseology has a Gnosticising aspect.

Such grounds render it probable that the passage is an addition to the epistle from a later hand. It is easy to assert that an interpolator would have avoided difficulties and irregularities of construction, making all simple and complete; but the assumption implies that he was able to write as well as if not better than Paul, which there is no reason for supposing. An officious

[1] ᾧ ἡ δόξα, κ.τ.λ. [2] διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[3] See Reiche's *Commentarius Criticus in N. T.* vol. i. p. 88, *et seq.*

compiler may be a bad composer. Unusual, awkward, and obscure phrases, put together in a brief compass, cannot favour identity of authorship with a composition which does not exhibit the same irregularity and harshness, unless it be supposed that the writer became suddenly careless, or was hurried and interrupted. Fritzsche, however, imagines that he had leisure enough ;[1] and makes the apostle dictate the doxology to an amanuensis after he had read over the letter, or heard it read by another ; a suggestion which Mr. Moule improves upon by supposing that the apostle's *own hand* added it. What Moule strangely calls a 'rapturous' doxology is assigned, with all its irregularities of construction, to Paul himself ;[2] which is doing him an injustice. The apostle wrote better than that, as Tholuck rightly felt when suggesting great haste as the cause of such negligence. The so-called rapturous doxology is made up of ideas and phrases from other epistles, specially that of Jude. The defenders of the passage, of whom the ablest is Fritzsche, have not succeeded in clearing away its difficulties of language and construction.

The varying position shows a feeling of its unsuitableness at the end of the epistle where it was originally placed. It could not be transferred to the 15th chapter, which is formally concluded ; and therefore it was appended to the 14th, where the apostle speaks of the weak ; and the words 'to him that is of power to stablish you' appropriately follow. Modern critics have also felt the singularity of its position at the end of the epistle and placed it at xiv. 23. Griesbach and Matthæi, Mill and Wetstein, take this view. De Wette himself admits that there is something remarkable in its isolated position at the end of the epistle, after a closing benediction ; but he has no other explanation to offer than Fritzsche's guess.

[1] *Pauli ad Romanos Epistola*, tom. i. pp. xxxviii-xlix, prolegom.
[2] *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, p. 255.

The whole of the 16th chapter we take to be spurious. The numerous persons mentioned in it as Paul's acquaintances at Rome, though he had never been there, testify against it. It is true that there was considerable intercourse between the metropolis and the provinces, and that he had known several of the individuals in Asia Minor; but these circumstances are insufficient to account for the long list of those saluted by name; a list which shows obvious desire on the part of the writer to bring the apostle into close friendship with many of the persons named, and to enumerate their meritorious services to him. Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion are his *kinsmen*. Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, sending salutations, are also his kinsmen. Rufus's mother is termed Paul's mother. Aquila and Priscilla laid down their necks for his life. Mary bestowed much labour on him. It is also said of Andronicus and Junia, that they were 'of note among the apostles, and in Christ' before him. All this savours of a Pauline Christian, who took an interest in pointing out the close relation which subsisted between Paul and the best-known members of the Roman Church. In the epistles written from Rome Paul does not mention the same individuals. Besides, Aquila and Priscilla were at Ephesus shortly before the writing of the epistle; now they are at Rome; and immediately after they reappear at Ephesus. Epenetus, the first fruits of Asia, is also specified as at Rome; Andronicus and Junia are fellow-prisoners of his, at a time when he was not in prison.

An attempt has been made to find, among the persons mentioned in the 16th chapter, the names of the members of Cæsar's household, who commend themselves to the brethren at Philippi in the Philippian epistle. In the columbaria or sepulchres described by the Marchese Campana and Canina, names of buried persons have been found identical with several in the chapter. Tryphœna, Philologus, Julia Amplias or Ampliatus, Ur-

bana, Apelles, Junia, Rufus, Hermes, Hermas. The coincidence appears striking at first sight; and it is possible that some of the names may point to the very persons specified by the apostle. But most of them were common from the time of Julius Cæsar to that of Adrian. Julius and Rufus, Hermes and Hermas, Junia, Urbana, Ampliatus, Apelles, occur more than once in the inscriptions. Tryphœna and Philologus were rarer. Nothing can be built on this foundation. The authenticity of the 16th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, or of the whole work, can hardly be strengthened by coincidences of names which are but possibly identical. We know that Christianity had spread extensively in Rome when Paul wrote to its adherents there; but whether any of Cæsar's household had embraced it at the time; whether Tryphœna was attached to the service of Messalina because an inscription has Valeria Tryphœna, the former being the Gentile name of the empress; and whether Philologus belonged to the palace because Livia is found in the same inscription as that which has his name, it is impossible to affirm.[1]

After the general terms, containing nothing characteristic, in which heretics are spoken of (17–20), the severe and authoritative tone in the 19th and 20th verses gives colouring to the description, and contrasts with the mild language of the epistle. It is easy to say, that the errorists referred to *had not caused* divisions, but were only likely to do so; that they were Jewish zealots outside the church different from the Judaisers pointed at in the 14th chapter; but the language leaves another impression on the mind. 'The God of peace shall bruise Satan (whose instruments these sectaries are) under your feet shortly,' shows Judaisers already active and dangerous.

There is much plausibility in Schulz's conjecture, that xvi. 1–20 was written from Rome to the Ephesians;

[1] See *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, No. x. p. 57, *et seq.*

and Ewald adopts it, thinking that xvi. 3–20 was inserted from a lost epistle to the Christians at Ephesus.[1] This conjecture, however, does not solve the difficulties connected with the doxology. How is it that the epistle without xvi. 1–20 or 3–20 has no benediction, but terminates with a doxology, contrary to Paul's manner; the 24th verse being a spurious interpolation? That the whole chapter formed an original part of the Roman epistle, can scarcely be admitted by such as are alive to the internal difficulties in the way of that opinion, and the apologies made to meet them.

The critic has only to look calmly at the number and quality of the guesses which the advocates of the 16th chapter make in its favour, to strengthen his doubts of its authenticity. Renan supposes that the body of the epistle was sent not only to Rome but also to Ephesus, Thessalonica, perhaps to another place, with differing conclusions; and that the contents of the 16th chapter formed the terminations of the letter as it was forwarded to the last three. The epistle is converted into a condensed summary of Paul's theological doctrine—a body of divinity intended for most of the churches he had founded.[2] Though Canon Farrar pronounces this a simple and adequate solution, it appears to us both clumsy and improbable.

One of the most sensible defenders of the 16th chapter says, that in the midst of multiplied engagements and a short stay at Corinth, the apostle was several days, or even weeks, in writing the epistle; that he paused first at xv. 33, intending to finish there; that on the receipt of additional intelligence, with greeting of friends at Rome, he added xvi. 1–16; to which he subjoined the warnings and apparent conclusion in verses 17–20; his definite statements here originating in recent information; and finally, other

[1] *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 428.

[2] *Saint Paul*, pp. lxxii, lxxiii.

Christians at Corinth having visited the apostle, and desired him to express their salutations, he added another wish and prayer for the church (xvi. 24). The whole copy having been perused and corrected, the general doxology contained in verses 25–27 was subjoined. 'Nothing stands in the way of believing these things to be altogether probable,' says their simple-minded proposer; to which criticism replies, a great deal.

The Pauline origin of the 15th chapter is capable of better support than that of the 16th. Yet a careful examination will probably lead to the rejection of it as well as the 16th. Baur's arguments have much weight; and are adopted in the main by Lucht. Hilgenfeld and Schenkel's defences of both chapters as authentic consist of feeble reasoning. The Pauline authorship is difficult of defence.

A great part of the 15th chapter refers to the Jewish Christians in the church, whose favour the writer seeks to conciliate, addressing them in a deprecatory and self-excusing style. The accumulated citations of Old Testament passages, which are evidently meant to quiet their scruples, are a repetition of ix. 24–29. In short, the first part of the chapter (verses 1–13) is merely a feeble repetition of the ideas contained in the three that precede.

We read in xv. 8, 9, 'Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers; and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy,' &c. Is it in harmony with Paul's method to call Jesus Christ a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, &c.? Hilgenfeld's endeavour to parallel and justify this language by xi. 17, &c., Galat. ii. 17, is singularly weak. In the 16th verse the writer speaks of himself as the *minister*[1] of Jesus Christ to the Gen-

[1] λειτουργὸς, a later term for ecclesiastical officers.

tiles. Why is the name *apostle* avoided, though used at the beginning of the epistle? Is the hyperbolical language of the 19th verse, 'so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ;' or that of the 23rd verse, that the writer has no more space in the districts of his former agency, consistent with Paul's manner?

The 19th verse presupposes that the apostle began his preaching at Jerusalem and Judea; but this was not the case according to the epistle to the Galatians; though the Paul of the Acts adopts the latter view. Nor is the statement in the 20th verse, of the principle that Paul avoided preaching the gospel where it had been already known, a correct expression of the apostle's fundamental rule of action, at least in the universal way enunciated; else he would have not written to instruct the Romans.

Again, a comparison of verses 24, 28, 29, with chapter i. 10–15, shows some incongruity. The former represent the apostle's purpose to visit the Roman Christians *by the way*, on his distant journey to Spain; the latter convey the impression of his having them *chiefly* in view. The one passage describes the writer as wishing to pay the readers a passing visit; the other, a visit meant for themselves, without reference to his ulterior main purpose. Some effort is required to harmonise both. Still farther, the author of the 15th chapter follows Paul's words in the first chapter (compare 22, 23, with i. 11, 13), but diverges in verses 24, 28, 29, by inserting the Spanish journey, to which he makes the Roman one subordinate. Paul's language in other epistles, is applied in the 27th verse in a way not justified by Galat. ii. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 11; xvi. 1, &c.; 2 Cor. ix. 12, &c. It is more allied to xi. 15, &c., of the present epistle. In representing the Gentile Christians of Macedonia and Achaia as indebted to the saints at Jerusalem *for spiritual things*, there is some incon-

gruity. That they should be indebted to the apostle of the Gentiles for true instruction, is obvious; that their contributions to the poor in the metropolis of Judea should be given as a token of brotherly love, is natural; but how did these poor saints communicate their spiritual things to the Gentile Christians in Macedonia and Achaia? The last four verses of this chapter present nothing un-Pauline, and probably closed the epistle, following xiv. 23.

The non-authenticity of the 15th and 16th chapters is favoured by the fact which Origen mentions about Marcion, viz. that he cut them off the epistle;[1] meaning that they were not in copies which the reputed heretic had; for the accusations of the fathers directed against Marcion cannot be accepted without drawbacks. What motive could he have had in the present instance for omitting the chapters? His peculiar opinions had nothing to do with them. To cut them off would not have served his cause. In the time of Origen, therefore, some MSS. were without the chapters. Tertullian himself, with all his vituperation, does not specify *falsification* of the epistle as he would have termed it; but contents himself with the vague assertion that Marcion made great pits in the epistle and abstracted from it whatever he wished.[2] Epiphanius, too, is silent about this corruption of the text.[3] Marcion transmitted no more than fourteen chapters to his disciples, either because his MS. had no more, or because he thought the last two unauthentic. Irenæus too ignores them; for they are never quoted among his numerous references to the epistle. The addition took place early, because it is in all known MSS. except a Latin one mentioned by Wetstein.

How these chapters got to be affixed to the epistle

[1] *Comment. in Ep. ad Romanos.*

[2] *Adv. Marcion.* v. 13. See Griesbach's *Hist. text. Græci epist. Paulin.* sect. 2, § 5.

[3] *Hæres.* 52, vol. i. p. 318. *Opp.* Colon. 1683.

is hard to explain. Part of the 16th chapter (verses 3–20) probably belonged at first to a letter addressed to the Ephesians. The rest of the chapters is made up of pieces, all of which may not have been written with one design, nor to supplement the writing with which they are now connected. Perhaps the 15th chapter shows a tendency to limit Paul's ministry to certain districts; reserving Rome, Italy, and Gaul for another apostle. Room is made for Peter, the proper head of the church. In this way a catholicising element is early seen in the epistle.[1]

There is no foundation for the opinion that the writer intended his work for Christians generally, the dwelling-place being inserted by transcribers agreeably to the context or tradition. There is indeed a trace of this in G., which omits the words 'in Rome' (i. 7) and 'those in Rome' (i. 15); but A., B., C., far older and better copies, have the inscription, 'to the Romans.'

### THE LANGUAGE.

Though it may seem strange, at first sight, that the epistle was not written in Latin, which was the language of the Romans, there is abundant proof of its Greek original. Latin was then the language of northern Africa, where the old Italic version or versions originated, of which revisions were soon made in parts of Italy distant from Rome, not in the metropolis itself. The note of the Syrian scholiast on the Peshito, that Paul wrote in Latin, is groundless. The Greek language was understood and employed at Rome in the first century. The Jews residing there learned it by intercourse with the Greek-speaking inhabitants and with the Romans themselves, many of whom preferred it to the Latin. The oldest Jewish tombs of Rome have Greek inscriptions, as we learn from Aringhi.[2] Gentile

[1] Comp. Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 504, etc.

[2] *Roma subterranea*, vol. i. p. 397, etc.

Christians generally understood Greek, as we infer from Martial, Tacitus, Juvenal, and Ovid. Dionysius of Corinth and Irenæus wrote in Greek to the Roman Christians. Justin Martyr, who resided in Rome for a time, wrote his apologies to the Roman emperors in the same tongue. Clement and Hermas wrote in Greek. Of the names of the first twelve bishops of Rome, ten are Greek and only two Latin. The diffusion of the Greek language was greatly promoted by the multitudes of Greeks that flocked to the imperial city. The majority of slaves, mechanics, and artisans were of Greek origin; and the Romans, addicted to foreign practices, were ready to adopt the language of the conquered. Hence Greek became the favourite tongue of the educated classes. It is also probable that Greeks formed part of the church; though it would be hazardous to assert that the Gentile members were of foreign origin, not native Greeks.

CONTENTS.

The most general division of the epistle is into two parts, one doctrinal, the other practical; the former embracing chapters i.–xi., the latter xii.–xvi. These again may be subdivided.

1. CHAPS. I.–XI.

(*a*) i. 1–v. (*c*) ix.–xi.
(*b*) vi.–viii.

2. CHAPS. XII.–XVI.

(*a*) xii. xiii. (*c*) xv. xvi.
(*b*) xiv.

Formal divisions cannot be looked for, because the parts run more or less into one another, and pauses are rare. The writer often goes back upon thoughts and develops them in a different way. The most marked pause is at the end of the 8th chapter.

To the salutation the apostle subjoins a few introductory verses, in which he announces his calling by the Son of God, his gratitude for the faith of the Roman Christians, his continual remembrance of them in prayer, and his great desire to visit them personally for the purpose of imparting some spiritual gift that they may be established. The importance of the gospel he sets forth in emphatic terms, passing to the great theme of the epistle, justification by faith, in the 16th and 17th verses (i. 1–17).

He proceeds to show that all men, Gentiles and Jews, are sinners, transgressors of the divine law, and exposed to the wrath of God; and therefore they need the revelation of the righteousness which is of faith. He demonstrates the sinfulness of the Gentile world (i. 18–32), and affirms that the Jews are equally guilty (ii. 1–29), without distinctly denying their privileges. In consequence of this argument, in which Jew and Gentile are reduced to the same level by the requirements of the moral law, an objection might readily occur to the Jew. What profit is there in belonging to a divine economy? Having advanced what seemed derogatory to Judaism, Paul softens the apparent severity of his statements, by pointing out the privileges and preferences of the Jews (iii. 1–8). After the digression, which interrupts the regular course of the argument, he resumes the line of thought, and sets forth the result which had been already announced to the Jews, as a subject of serious reflection, viz. that there is no difference between them and the Gentiles, since they had forfeited their privileges by unbelief. Both are alike guilty, as is shown by quotations from the Old Testament (iii. 9–20).

Having proved that all need the salvation revealed in the law of righteousness, the apostle advances a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Here he establishes a theme announced in the seven-

teenth verse of the 1st chapter, justification by faith without the deeds of law. The Gentile is expressly included in the circle of the faithful ; and instead of the law being made void by the doctrine of free salvation, it is established (iii. 21–31).

The question before asked, in reference to the Jew, is now put with relation to Abraham, What advantage had he, if Jew and Gentile are alike? Instead of directly answering it in the negative, Paul points out that the same righteousness by faith, without the works of the law, was communicated to him even before circumcision, that he might be the father of all believers, Jews or Gentiles. After setting Abraham's faith in a striking light, the writer applies to all believers what is affirmed of him. The mind of the reader is turned from the fleshly to the spiritual Abraham, with whom the Gentile as well as the Jew may be associated through faith in Christ (iv. 1–25).

The inward fruit of justification by faith is described in the first eleven verses of the 5th chapter. By it the believer obtains peace with God, a hope which enables him to glory in afflictions, and a consciousness of the divine love arising out of the thought that Christ died for him (v. 1–11). In illustrating this topic, he resumes the universal aspect of the plan of salvation already stated, in the persons of the first and second Adam. A stream of death and corruption had flown forth upon the human family from Adam. From Christ the second Adam proceeds a righteousness which sanctifies. All sinned. Death, the consequence of sin, reigned even over persons who had no positive or revealed law, as well as over those who transgressed a written one. Thus sin and death were universal. The salvation of Christ counterbalances the wide-wasting effects of Adam's one offence. It is even more beneficial than the other is destructive. Sentence was passed for one offence, involving condemnation ; whereas the free gift

has relation to many offences. Where sin abounded, grace abounds much more. The law could not obviate the consequences of sin, but awakened a sense of iniquity, nourishing the desire for a full redemption. Thus the fruits of salvation by faith are compared with the disastrous effects of sin, so as to present a remarkable contrast in favour of the first. The remedy is co-extensive with the disease and even exceeds it. This is illustrated by contrasts between Adam and Christ (v. 12–21).

Having shown the righteousness that is of faith and the superabundance of grace in redemption, in the preceding chapter, he stops to meet an objection that might be taken to the doctrine on the ground of its tendency to encourage sin. Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound ? No ; for the Christian is dead to sin, the symbol of which state is baptism. United to Christ, the believer dies with him, and rises again to a new life. Sin has therefore no more dominion over him. He is not under the law, seeking justification by it, but under grace (vi. 1–14). The same argument is now put differently. We cannot sin, because by so doing we become the servants of sin. Christians are freed from the bondage of sin producing death, and have yielded themselves to the service of righteousness (vi. 15–23).

The 6th chapter is directed against Christian antinomianism, as the third was intended to meet Jewish antinomianism. In both cases, error is exposed by taking away the externality of the foundation and showing the inward state or life. Neither privilege nor gift of grace can furnish a motive for acting in opposition to the true subjectivity in which the substance of the privilege and gift consists.

The writer had said in the fourteenth verse, 'Sin shall not have dominion over you ; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.' To illustrate and enforce this, he now compares the relation of the believer to

the law, to the case of a wife who has lost her husband. As the widow is free from the law, and may marry again; so the believer, freed from the law, is prepared to be affianced to Christ. Immediately after, the believer is compared to the dead husband, and, like him, is freed from the law. The apostle means to express the same idea in vii. 1–7 as that which he had termed before a *death unto sin*; he presents it now as a death to the law.

Having mentioned in the fifth verse the sinful affections which the law excites, the writer explains and illustrates this at considerable length, showing the operation of law on the human heart. It is inefficacious to sanctify the soul, and is the occasion of bringing forth fruit unto death, unless there be a death to sin. But it is effectual in imparting the knowledge of sin, which is the first step to amendment. The purport of the passage vii. 7–25 is to assert the true nature of the law and vindicate it from the charge of sin. In doing so, the apostle shows the relation it bears to human nature. It produces uneasiness, conflict, disquietude of mind. By its prohibitions it arouses the evil propensities and aggravates human guilt. It does not develop a new life in union with Christ, nor give true peace of conscience. Yet it is not sinful but spiritual, because the better nature approves of it (vii. 7–25).

It is wrong to take the 6th and 7th chapters, with Mangold, as a kind of episode intended to obviate possible misconceptions of v. 20. They belong to the first part of the epistle, which explains and justifies the gospel of righteousnes by faith, with relation to scruples about its moral effects.

The apostle now describes the state into which the believer is brought after the combat has passed. He is removed from condemnation, and lives after the tendency of his spiritual nature, not after the flesh (viii. 1–15). By the spirit the Christian is made conscious of

his adoption, and participation of the everlasting inheritance provided. This inheritance far exceeds the sufferings of the present life: all long and hope for it, and while cherishing such hope with steadfastness and confidence in God, they cannot be brought to shame. Their heavenly Father has given them a pledge of all other blessings in his only-begotten Son, and they have nothing to fear, because nothing can separate them from the love of God (viii. 16–39).

The 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters are not, properly speaking, an appendix to the preceding part of the letter. Neither are they the centre and essence of the whole, as Baur supposes, but a subordinate portion. The theme is still the same. The writer justifies further the righteousness of faith, against the national misgivings of Jewish Christianity. The ancient people of God appeared to be cast back by the free admission of the Gentiles to the salvation of Messiah. This fact was a perplexing one, not only to the Jews but the apostle himself. He endeavours to explain it by the unconditional right of divine election and the blindness of the Jews themselves; but adds a consolatory conclusion, that God has not wholly cast away his people: their fall, which is the occasion of salvation to the Gentiles, is only temporary.

Having demonstrated the necessity, and described the plenitude of salvation by faith alone, the apostle might have concluded his argument. But the admission of the Gentiles is too important to be dismissed with brief notices. Feeling that a religion which insists on faith as necessary to salvation had not met with acceptance on the part of the Jews, who rejected it in the spirit of a proud exclusiveness, the apostle expresses his deep sorrow for their unbelief, and offers an explanation of that divine arrangement, in accordance with which the body of the Jewish nation was excluded from the Christian covenant. God's promise to the seed of

Abraham had not been frustrated by the rejection of the people, since there was a spiritual, as well as a fleshly heir. He had selected Isaac to the exclusion of Ishmael, and Jacob in preference to Esau. Nor is there injustice in God's choosing according to his own will. The principle of selection is founded on the divine sovereignty, in the exercise of which He dispenses his mercy as He pleases. There is no ground of objection to this doctrine, because of the uncontrollable necessity imposed on the creature's actions, when Jehovah displays his grace toward some, as He had done to those who were called, and his wrath towards others, as He had done towards the body of the Jewish nation (ix. 1–29).

Having justified God in selecting some and rejecting others according to his good pleasure, and showed that the prophets themselves spoke of the rejection of the Jews and the admission of another people, he states that they were the authors of their own fall. While the Gentiles obtained justification, the Jews had not, because they sought it by works. In their zeal for legal righteousness, they overlooked the righteousness of faith. The writer then digresses to notice the objections of the Jews, and shows that they are disproved by their own prophets who foretold the rejection of the nation and admission of the Gentiles (ix. 30–x. 21). After explaining the divine procedure in rejecting the Jews and calling the Gentiles, the apostle subjoins certain considerations calculated to soothe the minds of his countrymen. God had not wholly cast off his people. He had graciously chosen a remnant to be partakers of salvation. Though the people are given up to their own obduracy as had been predicted in the Old Testament, even in their fall Jehovah had a purpose of mercy. So far from his design *terminating* in the nation's rejection, that very rejection was the means of conferring the privileges of the gospel on the Gentile world. And

the Gentiles have no reason to cherish feelings of proud superiority relative to the Jews. After they are converted, Israel will be saved.

A patriotic feeling influences the apostle in saying that Israel will be saved, after all. It is the wish of his heart. He hopes that the fulness of the Gentiles may usher in the salvation of the Jewish nation. The subject is concluded with an ascription of praise to God, whose perfections are unsearchable and ways past finding out; who dispenses all blessings according to his will (xi. 1–36). It will be observed that the apostle ceases to direct his view to the Jewish Christians, and turns to the Gentile part of the church, at the 11th verse of the 11th chapter. The transition is informal but not the less noticeable.

The practical or hortatory part of the epistle is contained in chapters xii.–xv. Here the admonitions are partly general, referring to Christian life under all aspects, and partly adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the Roman church. The 12th chapter enjoins personal holiness, unity, humility, and the Christian graces generally. The 13th commands subjection to the existing civil powers; honesty; mutual love enforced by the near approach of the day of the Lord. Here Jewish Christians are specially in view. Apprehension was felt lest they should continue to cherish the sentiments they held respecting heathen rulers before they became Christians, and be tempted to rebel against the government. They submitted to the Roman yoke with uneasiness. Looking at the oppression they had to endure under it, and contrasting their religion with the idolatry of the powers that crushed them, they were inclined to revolt against their rulers. These feelings they carried into the Christian religion. There is no evidence indeed, that the Jewish Christians of the church had become rebels against the reigning authorities, cruel though those authorities were; but the writer was probably

aware of manifestations of feeling which might prejudice the Christian cause. The subject was delicate and important. The apostle gives it a general bearing, so that the special circumstances which led to its introduction are liable to be forgotten in the universality of its aspect. His doctrine is passive obedience, one that cannot be adopted without harm to the progress of civilisation. Wicked rulers like Nero, usurpers like the first and third Napoleons, should be resisted or dethroned. Civil liberty is opposed to passive obedience. But the times and causes of resistance to tyrants must be carefully considered. What was best for the Roman Christians under Nero, or what the writer inculcates as best generally, is unsuited to all times. Though primitive Christianity did not disturb the existing arrangements of civil society, it does not follow that its spirit allowed bad rulers to act unrestrained.

Chapters xiv.–xv. 13 refer to the mutual treatment of the two classes in the church. Essenism had probably penetrated into the ecclesiastical life of the church.[1] The 'weak' were Jewish Christians who not only observed sabbaths and feasts, but held such Ebionite principles as abstinence from flesh and wine. Their Christianity had an Essene colouring; for such abstinence was practised by the Essenes; but it was Ebionite too. No good reason exists for denying the ordinary Jewish Christianity, coloured as it may have been by Essenism of the majority in the church and resolving it into an extreme asceticism on the part of a few who were essentially christianised Essenes. This conversion of the weak into an extreme party among the Jewish Christians, leads to the assumption of an opposite extreme among the Gentile Christians, whose freedom was ultra-Pauline. The apostle refers, not to extremes, but merely to the two constituent elements of

[1] Ritschl's *Altkatholische Kirche*, p. 232, *et seq.* 2nd ed.

the church. Why should the Jewish Christian majority be separated by a mild form of the usual belief from a small party among them ; or the Gentile Christian minority be considered moderately Pauline in contradistinction from an extreme few who pushed their principles to excess ? The hypothesis, advocated though it be by Mangold and Ewald, is untenable. In relation to the two classes the apostle enforces the principle of charity. The strong and the weak were not to condemn one another, but to live in peace. The subject of mutual forbearance is resumed at the beginning of the 15th chapter, and receives a more general application to Jews and Gentiles, supported by quotations from the Old Testament. The writer adopts a milder tone, justifying former severity by his ministerial office, which leads him to speak of the success attending his labours, the wide sphere of his activity, especially in fields unoccupied, and his long-projected journey to Rome after he had visited Jerusalem. In anticipation of the dangers and obstacles with which that journey was beset, he requests the prayers of his readers, and concludes with a benediction (xv.).

The 16th chapter contains a recommendation of Phebe, the bearer of the letter, various salutations, a warning against persons who caused dissensions, and an ascription of praise to God (xvi. 1–27).

From this brief analysis it will appear that the apostle does not follow a determinate plan. The separate parts of the epistle are not elaborated in logical relation to the whole. The sequences and turns of thought, the phrases and connecting particles, result from no studied purpose. Systematic precision cannot be attributed to the work. There may have been a clearly defined outline in the writer's mind when he began, to which he adhered in the main ; but great freedom shows itself in details. Digressions occur ; sudden interruptions of the train of thought by subordinate

ideas ; parenthetic clauses ;[1] plays upon words. There are also repetitions. The apostle reverts to the same thoughts, and expresses them differently. Calm progression towards one conclusion is not his method ; retrogression marks his path as well. He breaks off the thread of discourse, and returns to it. He avoids saying directly what he had indirectly established, and introduces the utterance of strong feeling instead. Conflicting emotions in his mind influence modes of expression ; and convictions are softened by motives of delicacy or ardent love of the nation. Figurative language supplies the place of prosaic statement. Arguments and illustrations from the Old Testament are freely used. The prophets are quoted to show what they did not intend. Their words are applied in a sense alien to the connection, or adapted by alteration to a particular purpose. Important terms occur in shifting senses, and elude attempts to fasten them to the same ideas. They narrow and widen according to the will of the author or the exigencies of the places they occupy. Thus the words rendered *law*, *creature*, *righteousness*, *justification*, vary in sense even in the same context, refusing to speak the exact alphabet of theologians who disfigure revelation by throwing the sacred writers into one crucible and drawing out a harmonious system ; or by confining an author like Paul to a circle of ideas expressed in exact phraseology. Nothing can be more improper than to treat his language as though it were logically precise ; to build up doctrinal propositions on isolated sentences, or to make them polished stones in the structure of a creed. His thoughts and phraseology must be taken in their general breadth and bearing.

[1] Too many parentheses have been assumed by unskilful interpreters, of which v. 13–17 and ix. 3 are examples. The latter is peculiarly unfortunate ('for I myself did wish to be anathema from Christ'), as if the words referred to the time prior to Paul's conversion; whereas Paul only expresses, in hyperbolical language, the affection he bore to his countrymen.

The forcible outpourings of an inspired mind, they can never cease to stimulate and instruct those who read; but they cannot satisfy the speculative and philosophical. Christianity is for all, for the childlike and teachable more than the critical; and the greatest expounder of it, after its Founder, will be better appreciated by the humble-minded learner than the philosopher. The truths on which Paul insists appeal to the moral instincts of man, and while approved by the highest judgment, fail to satisfy scientific processes of argument because they are for mankind in the aggregate, not an educated portion merely; for humanity as it is, with its broad hopes and fears, its wants and weaknesses, rather than the select few who philosophise about problems remote from the uppermost necessities of the heart.

### PARAGRAPHS INTERPRETED.

'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) Therefore as by the offence

of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous' (v. 12–19).

This passage has been minutely canvassed by controversial theologians ; and has served as the foundation of current dogmas among polemics. It has been built upon with laborious skill, as if it contained important truth which it were unsafe to misapprehend or deny. We must restrict ourselves to the barest outline of its meaning, leaving the reader to fill it out for himself.

The construction is irregular. There is no clause corresponding to 'as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned ;' and the apodosis has to be supplied out of 'who is the figure of him that was to come' (v. 14). The writer turns aside from the construction at the beginning.

*Sin entered into the world by one man*, i.e. by Adam ; *and death by sin.* Sin is here spoken of as a person. It does not mean what is called *original sin.* The entrance of sin into the world by Adam's act of transgression caused death, i.e. physical death. Whether such death solely, it is difficult to decide, because spiritual and physical death may be comprehended in the one word. The latter was predominant in the apostle's mind ; we cannot say that the former was altogether excluded.

*And so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned.* In consequence of the connection between Adam's sin and death as cause and effect, death came upon all, inasmuch as all sinned. Does this language mean that all sinned *in and with* Adam as their representative ? The reasoning of the apostle implies an affirmative answer to the question. The transgression of Adam was the transgression of all because of the mystical

identity of the race with their representative and head. The sin of the mass was involved in the sin of Adam.

*For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.*

This verse meets an objection arising from what the apostle had already asserted, 'where no law is, there is no transgression.' How could all be sinners during the interval which elapsed from Adam to the giving of the Mosaic law, when there was no law? Sin is not charged to men where there is no law.

*Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.*

Notwithstanding this non-imputation of sin as personal guilt it still existed, as is proved by the fact that men died from Adam to Moses, even though they did not like Adam break a law distinctly promulgated.

*Who is the figure of him that was to come.* The apostle institutes a comparison between Adam and Christ, representing them as type and antitype. The comparison is rather by way of contrast, for the object of it is to show that greater benefits have resulted from the work of Christ than evils from Adam's fall. The cases of the offence and the free gift are different. If many died through the fall of one, much more has the grace of God, and the gift by grace, coming through one man Jesus Christ, abounded to many. There is another contrast. The effects of the offence and of the free gift are condemnation and justification—condemnation to many, arising from one man's offence; justification, after many offences, by one man's righteousness.

The eighteenth verse resumes the parallel begun at the twelfth, and puts the particulars of similarity and dissimilarity together. As by one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so the free gift came upon all men to justification of life, by one sen-

tence of justification. The *all* in the first case are the descendants of Adam; so are they in the second, because the sentence of justification has been passed once for all, and brings eternal life to such as appropriate it. Its consequences are available for all, and become real as soon as believed. Many were made sinners by the disobedience of one man, and many shall be made righteous by the obedience of one. How this takes place is not explained. The writer wishes to inculcate the great truth, that the reign of grace exceeds the reign of sin.

The apostle expresses an intimate connection between Adam and his posterity, by means of which Adam's sin and death caused the sin and death of his posterity. 'By one man many were made sinners.' Elsewhere, 'In Adam all die.' Whether he had a definite idea of this connection may be doubted, because he was intent on his parallel. Theologians however have put, or attempted to put, precision into his language, by representing him as teaching that as *all men sinned in and with Adam*, the personal *guilt* of his sin is imputed to each one of his posterity. Such is the doctrine of *original sin*, deduced from the apostle's language. Sin is the act of a conscious being who has a perception of right and wrong; and none can be rightly punished for another's sin, else the Judge of all the earth would act contrary to the moral sense He has implanted. If the language mean that 'Adam's sin was as truly the sin of every one of his posterity, as if it had been personally committed by him,' principles are attributed to God at variance with his moral perfections. The utmost that the apostle can mean is, that all were placed in the position of sinners, that their *objective relation* to God was determined at once and for ever by the sin of Adam, so that they are under sentence of death from the first. He does not take into account the *subjective moral condition* of individual

men; but looks at them in the mass as comprehended in Adam, and brought into a new objective relation to God by their sin with the head. They are under sentence of condemnation, in a state of alienation from God antecedently to any act of their own, as is shown by the universal reign of death—the death even of infants. It agrees with the doctrine of Paul to say that all die *penally* because of Adam's sin which was also their sin; but it disagrees with his language to say that *every individual* is subjected to *guilt* on account of Adam's transgression, because guilt is that state of a moral agent which results from his actual commission of a crime, knowing it to be such.

In explaining these passages, it should never be forgotten that the language is that of a speculative man with a mind of mystic tendency; that he adapted Jewish ideas to his Christian creed, and employed a phraseology expressive of his peculiar idiosyncrasy. He was not a western logician conducting a train of reasoning; but a man of strong feeling drawing comparisons to set forth one or two ideas; inexact in language, using single words without studied selection, and careless of construction or syntax. His doctrinal statements should not be pressed into modern church creeds, apart from their surroundings or limitations.

'What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then

that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know, that in me, (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin' (vii. 7–25).

This paragraph is perplexing to interpreters. As the language of it is not consistent with itself, and opposite states of feeling are expressed in various clauses, commentators have been at a loss about the general meaning. The leading question which arises on its perusal is: Does the apostle speak of a regenerate or unregenerate man? Before attempting an answer, it should be stated, that however the language may appear to change in the latter part, there is no good reason for dividing the paragraph into two, and appropriating them to such different persons as the unregenerate and regenerate respectively.

Verses 7–14 and 15–25 refer to the same general state of mind. As to the main point, whether the unrenewed or renewed man is described, if a categorical answer be demanded, it must be given in favour of the former. But no light is thrown on the interpretation by restricting the passage to one or the other; and the phraseology affords satisfactory ground for neither. Both classes of commentators—those who apply it to Christians and such as refer it to the unregenerate, are compelled to modify phrases which seem to stand in their way, as soon as they look at grammatical or linguistic considerations. Both are right and both wrong. The paragraph does not belong either to the unregenerate or to the regenerate alone, because, as Jowett truly says, 'Mankind are not divided into regenerate and unregenerate, but are in a state of transition from one to the other, or too dead and unconscious to be included in either.' The writer describes a conflict and progress in the soul, from its being awakened to a consciousness of sin by the law, till its emancipation and victory spoken of in the commencement of the eighth chapter. There is no regular progression in the combat. The stages are not described in exact gradation. Yet there is advancement notwithstanding. The soul's struggles become less violent as the power of sin grows weaker. The will gradually exercises more control over the knowledge and actions.

The *I* is an ideal person rather than the apostle himself. As the nature is divided into flesh and spirit, the *I* shifts from the one to the other or hovers between them. And as to the law spoken of, the writer had regard to the Mosaic law more than any other, though the law written in the heart was also in his thoughts.

The state described is to some extent ideal. Few men pass through all its stages, though many pass through some of them. Deep consciousness of sin, with imperfect views of the love of God and of the moral

law, will often produce a spiritual combat in strong minds. It was so with Luther. The experience of the apostle himself supplied some of the moods which he exhibits. The goodness of law, as well as its evil, are seen in the description. The condition is not a *law-state*, to use the phrase of the old divines; nor is it what they call a *gospel-state* of mind. It is a mixed condition—an incipient spirituality advancing to freedom and peace of conscience. The lower nature is checked by the higher; and though the will is enlightened, it does not uniformly carry out its determinations. Here as in other parts of the epistle, the writer uses the language of strong feeling, and paints the phases of a mind conscious of sin in shifting colours, agreeably to the varying shades of light and darkness which pass over it. It is therefore incorrect to press his phraseology into the service of theological systems, as Augustine did against Pelagianism. The further it is kept from the crucible of controversialists, the more intelligible it becomes. Why should there be so great anxiety to make it suit either the regenerate or the unregenerate man, as if the states of mind characteristic of each could be separated? Is there no transition of the one into the other—no blending of spiritual with unspiritual states of mind? Does not the flesh often get the better of the spirit in the Christian? Does not the spirit often control the flesh in him who is but half Christian in character and action?

It obscures the interpretation of vii. 7–25, to bring it into antithesis to viii. 1–17, as Tholuck does after Turretin. The two are not antagonistic, descriptive of non-Christian and Christian character respectively; the latter is the ultimate issue of the former. The difference between them is one of time and degree, not of essence. The final triumph of the spirit over the flesh is the aim and end of the spiritual combat described so vividly in vii. 7–25. The two complete the description of a state in which the awakened conscience,

struggling to get free from the trammels of guilt, suffers many reverses, but is at length released from the painful conflict, and has peace. The triumph is complete, but seldom realised in actual experience without recurring struggles.

# THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

## THE PERSON TO WHOM THE EPISTLE WAS ADDRESSED.

PHILEMON was a person of distinction in the church at Colossæ, remarkable for his Christian activity and hospitality. The position he occupied among the believers there is unknown. The apostle calls him his *fellow-labourer*, an appellation which has led many to suppose that he filled an office, either that of elder or deacon. The title does not necessarily indicate office. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him bishop at Colossæ, and a martyr in Rome under Nero. According to Michaelis, his house was a spacious one, because a part of the Christian community assembled in it, and travelling Christians were entertained. Others suppose that his premises were not very extensive, because the apostle requested him to prepare a lodging in a hired house, where he might receive all that came to him. It is probable that he was a man of substance in the place. The nineteenth verse shows that he had been converted by Paul, perhaps at Ephesus, for there is no evidence that the apostle was ever at Colossæ. Benson[1] argues that Philemon received the gospel from some of Paul's converts or assistants such as Timothy or one of the persons mentioned in Coloss. iv. 10, &c. and in Philemon (verse 23). His conversion would thus be owing to the apostle *indirectly*. But the expressions in the nineteenth verse are too strong for this. If some of the Colossians went

[1] *Paraphrase on the Epistle to Philemon*, p. 338.

to Ephesus and heard Paul preach there, may not Philemon have been one of them ?

Philemon had a church in his house, not consisting, as some suppose, of the members of his own family merely but of other believers. Along with him is mentioned Archippus, the same person spoken of in the epistle to the Colossians (iv. 17). Many think he was Philemon's son, and Apphia Philemon's wife. All seem to have been connected by family ties, or to have belonged to the little circle termed *the church in the house*; else Apphia would not have been introduced into a private letter. Onesimus, Philemon's slave, has been metamorphosed by tradition into bishop of Berœa in Macedonia, and is said to have suffered martyrdom at Rome. Others identify him with Onesimus bishop of Ephesus, so that Ephesus becomes Philemon's place of abode. Such is Holtzmann's opinion. But the Onesimus of Ephesus was a different person from him who is spoken of in our epistle.[1]

## OCCASION OF THE LETTER.

The slave Onesimus had run away from his master at Colossæ, fearing punishment for some crime or act of disobedience. It has been thought that he robbed Philemon (verses 11–18). The eighteenth verse, in which the word translated *wronged*[2] is explained by the verb *owes*,[3] may refer to *theft, something taken from* his master, but not necessarily so. Another opinion is, that he had been idle, and had run away to escape work; in which case the loss of service is referred to in the 18th verse. The language appears to us to denote some act of theft.

Having found Paul at Rome, he had been converted to the Christian faith. Perhaps he had known the apostle before.

[1] See *Ignat. ad Ephes.* i. 6.

[2] ἠδίκησέ. [3] ὀφείλει.

It is unnecessary to suppose that Philemon was keen and obstinate in his resentments, to account for the solicitude shown by the apostle in the matter. As far as we can gather from the letter, his disposition was benevolent. When Paul despatched Tychicus to Colossæ, with a letter to the Christians there, he took the opportunity of sending Onesimus back to his master with the present one, recommending him to his confidence.

## TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The time and place of writing are determined by the epistles to the Colossians and Philippians. The apostle was a prisoner either at Cæsarea or Rome. In favour of the former, Hilgenfeld refers to the request of the writer that a lodging should be prepared for him in Colossæ, because he hoped for a speedy release; that a date prior to A.D. 61 is implied, in which year Colossæ was partially destroyed by an earthquake; and that the mention of Epaphras, the writer's fellow-prisoner, of Mark who had a house in Jerusalem, of Aristarchus and Luke, who had accompanied Paul to Cæsarea (Acts xx. 4, 5), and afterwards to Rome (Acts xxvii. 2), suit Cæsarea best. These considerations are not conclusive. If the apostle expected a speedy deliverance from captivity, why should he go to Phrygia rather than Rome to which place he was proceeding when detained at Cæsarea? As to the earthquake, we do not know if Colossæ suffered with Laodicea. Tacitus speaks of the latter alone. Eusebius indeed says that the Laodicean earthquake affected Hierapolis and Colossæ; but he puts it in the tenth year of Nero. There is no reason for disturbing the old opinion that Paul was prisoner at Rome when he wrote this letter. Onesimus, who had charge of it, travelled with Tychicus. It should be dated A.D. 62, and was the first of those written in the Roman captivity.

## AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity was first questioned by Baur, whose ingenuity supplied several arguments in support of his opinion. He was followed by Holtzmann, who examines the epistle minutely, and discovers in it the use of the Colossian and Ephesian epistles, or rather a simultaneousness of situation, expression and ideas belonging to the three epistles which brings the present one into the second century. His essay is more ingenious than convincing.[1]

Supposed allusions to it in the Ignatian epistles must be omitted as irrelevant. The three places which Kirchhofer quotes from the epistles to the Ephesians, Magnesians, and Polycarp are too remote to be trusted. The earliest writer who expressly alludes to it is Tertullian: 'This epistle alone has had an advantage from its brevity, for by that it has escaped the falsifying hands of Marcion. Nevertheless, I wonder that when he receives one epistle to one man, he should reject two to Timothy, and one to Titus, which treat of the government of the church.'[2] Here it is asserted that Marcion received it into his canon.

It is in the Muratorian list.[3]

Origen speaks of it thus: 'Which Paul being aware of, in the epistle to Philemon said to Philemon about Onesimus,' &c.[4] Again: 'As Paul says to Philemon, "We have great joy and consolation in thy love, because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother."'[5]

[1] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1873, p. 428, etc.

[2] 'Soli huic epistolæ brevitas sua profuit, ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit.'—*Adv. Marcion.* v. 42.

[3] See Credner's *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, p. 76.

[4] *ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιστάμενος, ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φιλήμονα ἐπιστολῇ τῷ Φιλήμονι περὶ τοῦ Ὀνησίμου, κ.τ.λ.*—*Homil. in Jerem.* 19.

[5] 'Sicut Paulus ad Philemona dicit, Gaudium enim magnum habuimus,

Elsewhere: 'Of Paul it was said to Philemon, "Being such an one as Paul the aged," since he was a young man when Stephen was stoned for the testimony of Christ, and he kept the garments of them that slew him.' [1]

Eusebius also includes it in the canon.[2] Jerome, commenting on the epistle, alludes to some who either rejected or made objections to it; and in answering the objections affirms that it had been always received by all the churches.[3]

In the time of Jerome[4] there were some who did not receive it, asserting that it had been rejected by most of the ancients, which was a mistake. From the unimportant nature of its contents, these doubters supposed either that it did not proceed from Paul, or that he wrote it in his private, unapostolic capacity.

According to Baur, the language is un-Pauline. A considerable number of expressions do not appear in Paul's writings, but only in the epistles of questionable authenticity, such as *fellow-soldier* (2) figuratively, occurring in the pastoral epistles, *to enjoin that which is convenient* (8), *the aged* (9), *unprofitable, profitable* (11), *to receive* (15), *repay, owe* (19), *to have joy of* (20), *a lodging* (22), the thrice repeated *bowels*, a word, however, not un-Pauline.[5] It is also said, that the letter contains improbabilities; that it exhibits the beginning of a romance literature, like the Clementine homilies, the tendency of the romance being to show that what is lost on earth is gained in heaven. If we suppose that Paul

et consolationem in charitate tua, quia viscera sanctorum requieverunt per te, frater.'—*Comment. in Matt.* tract. 34.

[1] 'De Paulo autem dictum est ad Philemona, Hunc autem ut Paulus senex, cum esset adolescentulus quando Stephanus pro Christi testimonio lapidabatur, et ipse vestimenta servabat interficientium eum.'—*Ibid.* tract. 33.

[2] *Hist. Eccles.* iii. c. 25.

[3] *Comment. in Ep. ad Philem.*—*Opp.* vol. iv. p. 442.

[4] Præfat. *Comment. in Ep. ad Philem.*

[5] *συστρατιώτης, ἐπιτάσσειν τὸ ἀνῆκον, πρεσβύτης, ἄχρηστος, εὔχρηστος, ἀπέχειν, ἀποτίνειν, προσοφείλειν, σου ὀναίμην, ξενία, σπλάγχνα.*

and Onesimus were previously acquainted, and that the latter went to the apostle when he began to repent of his flight, no room will be left for that peculiar coincidence of accidental circumstances which Baur finds in the letter.[1]

Holtzmann assumes two interpolations proceeding from the author of that to the Ephesians, viz. verses 1, 4–6, which is an improbable conjecture.

CONTENTS.

The apostle states the case of Onesimus to Philemon, and entreats him to receive his servant again, not as a slave but a Christian brother. The first three verses contain the dedication and salutation. After this the writer thanks God for what he had heard of Philemon's faith and love towards the Lord Jesus and all saints, expressing his joy that he had behaved so generously to Christians (1–7). The proper subject of the letter begins at the eighth verse, and is continued till the twenty-first. As an apostle, he might have enjoined Philemon to do what Christian principle required in respect to Onesimus; but he rather chooses, as the aged prisoner of Christ, to beseech him to receive Onesimus, for though the latter had behaved improperly he was now a different person. Paul might have retained him to minister to himself, but would do nothing without Philemon's consent. Providence had made his departure the means of his reformation, that his master might receive him for ever, not as a slave but a brother. He therefore entreats Philemon to take him back, promising to pay or requite the master for any wrong the slave had done, should the former require it. But he is confident that the master will exceed the request (8–21). The last four verses are the conclusion, in which the writer desires Philemon to provide him a lodging, sends salutations

[1] *Paulus der Apostel*, pp. 475-480.

from several fellow-labourers, and wishes his correspondent the rich communication and continual presence of the favour of Jesus Christ.

The nineteenth verse shows that the apostle wrote the letter himself, to make the effect certain. Bertholdt's inference from it, that the preceding portion did not proceed from the apostle's own hand, is incorrect.

The letter is a friendly not a doctrinal one. It relates to a private matter between Philemon and his slave. But though it is of little importance as a public document relating to Christian truth or history, it is not without use, because it serves as a practical commentary on Coloss. iv. 6, putting Paul's character in a light which none other of his writings exhibits. The qualities which dictated its composition are eminently attractive. Dignity, generosity, prudence, friendship, affection, politeness, skilful address, purity, are apparent. Hence it has been called with great propriety, *the polite epistle*. True delicacy, fine address, consummate courtesy, nice strokes of rhetoric, make it a unique specimen of the epistolary style. It shows the perfect Christian gentleman.

Doddridge has compared it to an epistle of Pliny supposed to have been written on a similar occasion, pronouncing it far superior as a human composition; though antiquity furnishes no example of the epistolary style equal to that of the younger Pliny to Sabinian.

The opinion advocated by Wieseler[1] and Thiersch[2] that the epistle to the Laodiceans, mentioned in Coloss. iv. 16, is identical with the present one to Philemon, rests on mere assumptions—such as, that our letter was not addressed to Philemon alone but also to Archippus; and that both belonged to Laodicea. Nothing appears to us more certain than that they were members of the Christian community at Colossæ.

[1] *Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalt. u. s. w.*, p. 452, *et seq.*

[2] *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts u. s. w.*, p. 424, note 46.

# THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

## SOME CIRCUMSTANCES CONNECTED WITH PHILIPPI.

PHILIPPI belonged originally to Thrace, but was afterwards reckoned to Macedonia. According to Diodorus Siculus the old name was Crenides, from numerous springs in its vicinity. It was situated on a rising ground about nine miles inland, north-west of its harbour Neapolis. Philip, perceiving the importance of the situation, repaired and enlarged the town, fortifying it against the incursions of the Thracians, and from him it was called Philippi (B.C. 358). The battles fought near it are remarkable in history, especially the second.

The writer of the Acts notices it thus: 'which is the first place of the district, a city of Macedonia, a colony,' words that give rise to considerable diversity of opinion. When Paulus Æmilius conquered Perseus, he divided Macedonia into four parts or regions; and Philippi was assigned to the first of them with Amphipolis as its capital. The most natural interpretation is, the first Macedonian city at which one coming from proconsular Asia would arrive; Neapolis belonging to Thrace, not to Macedonia. Thus the adjective *first* respects *locality*. But many refer it to *political rank*, translating 'a *chief* city of that part of Macedonia.'

The apostle Paul visited Philippi on his second missionary journey, accompanied by Silas, Timothy, and Luke; and preached in a Jewish *proseucha* or temporary place of worship. But he suffered severe treatment at

the hands of the selfish heathen and magistrates of the place, by whom he was imprisoned. After a short stay he left the city (Acts xvi.). During his absence, Luke, Timothy, Epaphroditus, and perhaps Clement, laboured to enlarge and strengthen the church he had founded. He visited it again on his third missionary tour. Whether this happened when he passed through Macedonia on his way to Greece, accompanied by Tychicus and Trophimus, is more than doubtful; though some suppose that he even wrote there, at the time, the second epistle to the Corinthians. None but two visits can be made out with certainty (Acts xx.).

Philippi was the first European town that received the gospel, the standard of divine truth being planted where contending armies had met. While historians of Rome will point to Philippi as the scene of a memorable struggle, and lament over the fallen Brutus the stern defender of his country's freedom, religious historians will prefer to speak of a spiritual victory achieved by Christianity. Brutus and Cassius, Augustus and Antony, vanish from the view of enlightened patriotism before Paul and Silas, Luke and Epaphroditus, —victors nobler far than blood-stained Romans at the head of armies.

## AUTHENTICITY.

External testimonies in favour of the Pauline authorship are abundant and unanimous. Thus Polycarp writes to the Philippians: 'For neither I nor any one like me, can reach the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul . . . . who also, when absent, wrote to you letters, into which if ye look ye will be able to edify yourselves in the faith which has been given you.' [1]

[1] *οὔτε γὰρ ἐγώ, οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε, δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, κ.τ.λ.*— *Ep. ad Philipp.* c. iii.

Again: 'But I have neither perceived nor heard any such thing in you, among whom the blessed Paul laboured, who are [praised] in the beginning of his epistle. For he glories in you in all the churches which alone knew God then.'[1]

Irenæus says: 'As Paul also says to the Philippians: "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."'[2]

The following occurs in Clement of Alexandria: 'When Paul confesses of himself, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect,"' &c.[3]

Tertullian writes: 'Of which (hope) being in suspense himself, when he writes to the Philippians, "If by any means," says he, "I might attain to the resurrection of the dead: not as though I had already attained, or were perfected."'[4]

In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, the following quotation occurs from the second chapter: 'who also were so far followers and imitators of Christ, "Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God,"' &c.[5]

In modern times the authenticity has been questioned. Schrader took exception to iii. 1–iv. 9. Baur and

[1] *ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτο ἐνόησα ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδὲ ἤκουσα, ἐν οἷς κεκοπίακεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, οἵτινές ἐστε ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ· περὶ ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καυχᾶται, αἱ μόναι τότε θεὸν ἐπεγνώκεισαν.—Ep. ad Philipp.* c. xi.

[2] 'Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus ait: Repletus sum, acceptis ab Epaphrodito quæ a vobis missa sunt, odorem suavitatis, hostiam acceptabilem, placentem Deo.'—*Adv. Hæres.* iv. 18, 4, p. 1026, ed. Migne.

[3] *αὐτοῦ ὁμολογοῦντος τοῦ Παύλου περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· Οὐχ' ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, κ.τ.λ.* —*Pædagog.* lib. i. p. 107, D. See also *Stromata*, iv. p. 511 A.

[4] 'Ad quam (justitiam) pendens et ipse, quum Philippensibus scribit, si qua, inquit, concurram in resurrectionem quæ est a mortuis; non quia jam accepi, aut consummatus sum.'—*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. xxiii.

[5] *οἳ καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ζῆλωταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ ἐγένοντο, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ' ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.*—Ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v. 2.

Schwegler rejected the Pauline authorship of the whole, and were followed by Volkmar, F. Hitzig, and Hinsch.

Let us glance at Baur's arguments.

1. The epistle moves in the circle of Gnostic ideas and expressions, which it appropriates and adopts with the necessary modification. This is specially observable in the obscure passage ii. 5–8: 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' The sixth verse is so peculiar, that the critic thinks it intelligible solely on the supposition that the writer had the Gnostic doctrine before his eyes, according to which Sophia, the last of the æons, moved by the intensity of its desires to know the absolute One, attempted to get hold of that knowledge but failed, and fell from the *pleroma* into emptiness or *kenoma*. What Sophia thus wished to obtain is tantamount to the *being equal with God*—an act of violence contrary to its nature, and a crime against the absolute Father. This is applied to Christ, of whom it is said that he did not act like Sophia.

Here much depends on the true explanation of the passage. It would be out of place to enter at length on its discussion and canvass the different views taken of it. All that we can do is to intimate our opinion in the shortest way. 'Being in the form of God' is nearly equivalent to 'the image of God,' and 'an effulgence of his glory;' expressions in the epistles of other writers. 'The being equal with God' is the object of robbery or seizure.[1] And the sense is, who existing in the form of God, a person consisting of heavenly spirit, a pre-existent being,

[1] We take ἁρπαγμός as equivalent to ἅρπαγμα, the thing to be seized. See Grimm in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1873, p. 38, &c.

did not look upon equality with God as a thing to be grasped at, but emptied himself by laying aside the form of God and taking upon him the form of a servant. He did not grasp at something beyond and above what he had already, but did the very opposite in divesting himself of what he possessed. He gave up the divine dignity and assumed the condition of a servant in a body of flesh. The Philippians are exhorted to practise the duty of unselfish, self-sacrificing love by the high pattern of one who did not arrogantly catch at supreme sovereignty or equality with God, but abased himself by descending from his pre-existent state, or rather by veiling his personality in an earthly body even that of a slave. According to this interpretation, the contrast between what Christ would have done had he selfishly caught at equality with God is set over against what he actually did in emptying himself. Instead of aiming at absolute supremacy, that is, at equality with God, he did the very reverse. The passage is similar to 2 Corinthians viii. 9, where Christ's possession of premundane dignity or glory is said to have been given up by his taking a form of flesh. It is the same thing which is freely surrendered here, viz. pre-existent, heavenly glory—the form of God. The subordination of Christ to the Father is implied in the present passage, as it is in the other epistles of Paul; and any interpretation which brings out of it a view in harmony with the creeds of the churches is unnatural.[1]

The Pauline idea of Christ, contained in his authentic epistles, supposes him to be the pre-existent, heavenly, ideal man, the medium of creation, the organ through whom the divine government is conducted, our Lord, the Son of God. His person consisted of *pneuma* and *doxa*: the former not identical with a *human soul*, which Paul's anthropology seems to have excluded; the latter

[1] See, for example, the laboured notes of Bishop Lightfoot in his *Commentary*.

forming the substance of his body. When he appeared on earth, he laid aside the spiritual body and assumed an earthly or fleshly one. The transition was merely from one form of existence to another. Instead of retaining the heavenly body which was a substance out of the divine glory, he took an earthly body out of the substance of human flesh. In the body of light or glory he was 'in the form of God;' the body of flesh constituted 'the form of a servant.' The apostle knew nothing of a supernatural generation, for he speaks of Christ as 'made of the seed of David according to the flesh.' At the end of the world the dominion belonging to him as the Son is to be given up, that God may be all in all. His position and functions are to cease. He does not return to the same pre-existent state as before, but to the condition of other creatures to which he never properly belonged. Here is an incongruity which the fourth gospel avoids by representing the putting off of his glory as merely temporary, so that he returns to the full possession of the powers and functions he had before. According to Paul, he enters into a new condition; in the theology of the fourth gospel, he goes back to the original one, the pre-existent state having been merely interrupted.

The peculiarity of this christology is the idea that the pre-existent glorious Christ, so far from grasping at a possession out of reach, humbled himself even to the ignominious death of the cross, becoming thereby an example of lowly-mindedness. The thing out of reach was equality with God, and the interpretations which assume that such was his rank before the humiliation are incorrect. The words *form*, *likeness*, *fashion*, *being found*,[1] properly understood, are not docetic; and the whole passage, so far as it relates to the pre-existence of Christ, harmonises with Pauline doctrine. The Philippian writer speaks of the premundane form of

[1] μορφή, ὁμοίωμα, σχῆμα, εὑρεθείς.

existence, in which the Son did not clutch at equality with the Father, but condescended to assume the earthly form of a slave. Although therefore attempts have been made to represent the christology of the passage before us as different from Paul's, it is really the same; and not Johannine, as some think.[1] The tenth and eleventh verses of the second chapter are also pronounced Gnostic; but they agree with Rom. viii. 34; xiv. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 24–26. The idea of *hades*, which lies in the last of the three categories (heavenly, earthly, subterranean beings), is not specifically Gnostic, for it belongs to the New Testament (Luke xxiii. 43, &c.).

2. Baur alludes to the monotonous repetition of things already said; and a certain poverty of thought the consciousness of which the author himself expresses by saying, '*to write the same things to you*, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe.' This rests on a false interpretation. The apostle does not refer to things already said in the epistle, but either to a former letter he had addressed to them, or to what he told them when present.

3. The epistle wants a definite object and character. This can hardly be, when Judaisers are alluded to, though, it must be allowed, incidentally. It contains indeed less speciality than other letters; but it is not difficult to perceive an object which the writer had in view. If such object be general, it corresponds better to the nature of an affectionate letter prompted by the receipt of a gift from the Philippians.

4. The same critic takes offence at what is stated about the progress of the gospel in i. 12; iv. 22, the key to which, as he thinks, is found in iv. 3, where Clement of Rome is mentioned, who was a relation of Domitian's, and made into a friend of Tiberius's by the Christians. Clement had to be glorified as a fellow-

[1] Comp. Pfleiderer's *Paulinismus*, vol. i. p. 146, English version.

labourer with Paul, and connected with Cæsar's household. The great advance of the gospel in Rome was associated with this person. But the Clement of the epistle is a Philippian Christian, and has nothing to do with the Roman one. Hence, the Petrine Clement does not appear here as a Pauline Christian, showing a tendency in the unknown writer to conciliate the Pauline and Petrine Christians. In like manner the women at variance, Euodia and Syntyche, are said to represent mystically *parties* rather than *persons*; while *the true yoke-fellow* (iv. 3) is the apostle Peter, the syzygy of Paul. This is too ingenious to be adopted.

5. Un-Pauline particulars are said to appear in the epithet *dogs* (iii. 2), who however are elsewhere called *false apostles*, *deceitful workers*, and *Satan* himself (2 Cor. xi. 13, 14). The *concision* (iii. 2) is explained by the *excision* referred to in Gal. v. 12. The apostle, we allow, speaks severely of the Jewish Christians; but he had already uttered as hard words of similar persons in the second epistle to the Corinthians, ii. 17 (chapters x.–xiii.), as well as in that to the Galatians. His tone becomes calmer and more moderate after iii. 2, with the exception of iii. 19, till he leaves the subject at iv. 1.

But is not the severe tone adopted at the beginning of the third chapter inconsistent with the mildness used in chapter i. 15–18? How could the apostle rejoice in the fact of the Jewish Christians preaching Christ either in pretence or in truth, and afterwards denounce them as 'evil workers'? We reply, that he speaks of Judaisers in different places and in relation to different surroundings. In the first chapter they are in Rome, acting mainly upon the heathen population there, so that he could look upon their endeavours to win over such to Christ with a degree of satisfaction. It was otherwise with a church he himself had founded and taught. Warning the Philippians against Judaising teachers who might undo his work among them, he em-

ploys language similar to that directed against the persons who had marred the effect of his liberal doctrine in other Gentile churches. The Judaic Christians in Rome were otherwise circumstanced. Instead of directly thwarting the Pauline gospel, they might contribute to its final success by first bringing the ignorant heathen to an acquaintance with Christ, and an apprehension of his vicarious death, which the apostle himself had reached. Nor can we see that the contributions alluded to in iv. 15–18 excite suspicion, as if they were meant to support a fictitious situation of the apostle. When Baur says that they disagree with 1 Cor. ix. 15, and are derived from 2 Cor. xi. 9, he overlooks the fact that Paul himself, in the latter passage, says he took contributions from other churches.

These remarks must suffice as a reason for withholding assent from the view of Baur and Schwegler.

## UNITY.

Stephen Le Moyne[1] supposed that the Philippian epistle was divided into two, which were written on different rolls. The one, being separated into two parts, was reckoned two. By this expedient he explains the plural *letters* in the third chapter of Polycarp's epistle.

Schrader attacked the epistle's integrity, conjecturing that chap. iii. 1–iv. 9 is an un-Pauline insertion.

Heinrichs[2] thought that the epistle is composed of two letters—one addressed to the whole church, consisting of i. 1–iii. 1, ending with 'in the Lord,' together with iv. 21–23; the other, intended for the apostle's intimate friends only, beginning with, 'To write these same things,' iii. 1, and ending with iv. 20. When the New Testament epistles were collected, the

[1] *Varia Sacra*, vol. ii. p. 332, &c.

[2] In the prolegomena to his Commentary, published in 1803.

two are said to have received their present form and place. The same opinion, modified and corrected, was advanced by Paulus.[1] The words, 'finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord,' appear to indicate a speedy termination, as the analogy of 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Ephes. vi. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 1, shows. Not that the verb *rejoice*[2] is necessarily valedictory, meaning *farewell*; but that the adverbial expression rendered *finally* implies a brief summing up of all that the author wishes to add. In 1 Thess. iv. 1, the same formula stands at a considerable distance from the end of the epistle, as if it belonged to the close of an important topic. Perhaps the original intention was to finish with the second chapter, but when Epaphroditus did not set out immediately or additional information of the Judaisers was received, the author was moved to add a warning against corrupters of the truth.

### NUMBER OF PHILIPPIAN EPISTLES.

Bleek and others think that the apostle wrote more than once to the Philippians, deducing that opinion from a few passages in the present letter. In iii. 18, 'For many walk, of whom I have told you often,' i.e. in a former epistle. But the language may also refer to oral communications, as De Wette inclines to believe. Again, 'To write the same things to you' (iii. 1) may mean, 'the same things which I told you in a prior letter.' But it is capable of the sense, 'the same things which I previously taught when present;' or, it may refer to the repetition of the same thing in the present letter. The testimony of Polycarp has been adduced to strengthen the interpretation which supposes a former letter. In the third chapter of his epistle to the Philippians, that father speaks of Paul's 'epistles' to them. But the plural may be used for the singular, and the use of

[1] See Krause's *Opuscula*, pp. 3-32.

[2] χαίρετε.

the singular in the eleventh chapter of Polycarp may neutralise the plural of the third chapter. Yet the singular *may* refer to the *more prominent* of the epistles, i.e. the canonical one. Thus these passages afford nothing more than *a presumption* in favour of several epistles, without *proving* that Paul wrote more than one.[1]

### TIME AND PLACE.

It is obvious that the present epistle was written during the author's captivity at Rome, A.D. 62 or 63. The expression 'Cæsar's household' (iv. 22) is pretty clear in favour of Rome. Herod could scarcely be called Cæsar. Had Cæsarea been meant, we should expect another phraseology. But the word *prætorium* (i. 13) is referred to Cæsarea by Böttger,[2] since it is used of Herod's palace there, and is also applied to the residence belonging to the procurator of a Roman province (Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; John xviii. 28–33, xix. 9). Here, however, it means *the prætorian cohorts* at Rome, who formed the imperial body-guard. Paul, or at least his fellow-prisoners, were delivered to the prefect of these cohorts. It has also been alleged that Acts xxiii. 35 compared with xxviii. 16 shows Paul to have been kept in the *prætorium* at Cæsarea, whereas in Rome he had his own hired house, and therefore the *prætorium* points to Cæsarea. But the word means the prætorian soldiers rather than their camp.

The letter was written after that to Philemon, when the time of imprisonment was near its end. A considerable period is supposed to have elapsed since his incarceration, so that the good fruit of his ministry had become apparent (i. 12–14): 'But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which hap-

[1] See Lightfoot *on the Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 136, etc.

[2] *Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleit. in die paulinische Briefe*, Abtheilung 2, p. 47, *et seq.*

pened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear.' We know too from ii. 26 that Epaphroditus's coming was not very recent. Four journeys in which he was concerned had taken place: his own arrival and return, with the report of his sickness conveyed to Philippi and back again to Rome. It would also appear that the apostle was almost alone. His friends had gone away, or been sent to different places, except Timothy. Even Luke seems to have been absent (i. 1; ii. 20, 21; iv. 22, compared with Coloss. iv. 14). In these circumstances, the apostle was not without hope of a speedy release. 'But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly' (ii. 24). 'And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith, that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again' (25, 26). This hopeful language, however, is not uniform. Doubts mingled with trust, and therefore he writes, 'According to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death. Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all' (i. 20; ii. 17).

It is impossible to find in the epistle indications of any alteration for the worse in the prisoner's outward condition. The *contest* referred to in i. 30 is the opposition he encountered at Rome from the Jewish Christians—opposition from which he was never exempt where they were. The *first sorrow* implied in ii. 27 can only be his captivity generally. Such as seek for an intensification of his captivity, or a change in his cir-

cumstances, in these passages, search for what is not in them. The history of Nero's government also fails to prove a deterioration in Paul's situation. What though Burrus, the moderate prætorian prefect, died, and Tigellinus came into his place; though Octavia were divorced, and Poppæa married to the emperor; though Seneca lost his influence? These public events would hardly affect a prisoner like Paul, of whom courtiers and generals, senators and empresses would scarcely think. It is therefore a mere conjecture, that after Burrus's death Paul was treated more severely, being removed from his house, put into the barrack of the prætorian guards, and threatened with death. Neither the present epistle nor the history of the time countenances it. We admit that a tone of sadness appears in the letter; but that tone is mingled with hopefulness. Do not these words, 'having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you for all your furtherance and joy of faith' (i. 25), express the hope of a speedy release? The epistle may be dated near the end of the Roman captivity, and shortly before the writer's death. It is his testament—the last letter he wrote. For this reason a melancholy interest attaches to it. Soon after his hopes and fears of the future had found utterance, the noblest sacrifice which the world witnessed since that of the Master was freely offered.

The epistle was sent by Epaphroditus, perhaps one of the elders of the church, who had come to Rome with a pecuniary contribution. It was not the first occasion on which that church had expressed its gratitude in a similar way. The members had sent presents to the apostle twice before (Phil. iv. 15, 16). He had also partaken of their bounty at Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 9), though he declined to accept eleemosynary help from others. The Philippian messenger was seized with a dangerous illness, which may have arisen from the fatigue of his journey, or from his exertions at Rome in

connection with evangelical work ; and the news of his malady had reached the church at Philippi, which made him very anxious to return. The apostle himself was desirous to send him back as soon as he had recovered. He was not dismissed, however, without an equivalent for their seasonable present. In return for so great kindness, Paul wrote the present letter to the believers at Philippi, full of ardent affection and of high esteem for their messenger.

But how could the apostle be in want at the time he was relieved by the Philippians ? Was he neglected by the Christians at Rome? It is sufficient, in reply, to refer to his known practice, which was dictated by extreme delicacy and dignity. He worked with his hands rather than be a burden to the churches. This he could not do, now that he was a prisoner. The Romans had not been his converts, and he would therefore regard himself as unentitled to maintenance from them. He had also enemies in the city, who would ascribe interested motives to him.

## STATE OF THE CHURCH.

The Philippian church consisted of Gentile and Jewish Christians, almost entirely of the former ; and the members generally were not in affluent circumstances. That they were not numerous may be also inferred from the extent of the place. Philippi was the smallest city to which the apostle addressed a letter ; and its church was neither large nor flourishing.

Some critics have supposed that the Christian society was divided into parties or factions, arising from the efforts of false teachers who insisted on the necessity of circumcision. Judaising Christians, it is thought, had insinuated themselves into it, sowing the seeds of disunion, so that there were two parties, a Jewish Christian and a Gentile Christian one. The passages appealed to

for the existence of parties are iii. 1–8, 18, 19; and the admonitions in ii. 2–4, 12, 14; iv. 2, 5; iii. 2, &c., are supposed to intimate the same state. These are an insufficient foundation for the hypothesis. The 16th chapter of the Acts shows that there were Jews there, for they had a *proseucha*; and the warning in iii. 2, 3, implies danger from Judaisers; but there is no evidence that the latter had invaded the church or undermined the apostle's teaching. Paul applies a severe name to the Jewish Christians, *dogs*, who may have attempted to seduce some of the brethren; he describes them as 'enemies of the cross of Christ,' more immoral than heretical; but the Philippians were too steadfast to be drawn away. Though he had often warned them of danger, it does not appear from the epistle that they had so far forgotten his principles as to submit to legal observances or range themselves into factions.

The existence of parties in the church has been disproved by Schulz,[1] so that it is hardly necessary to do more than allude to the subject. How then were the Christians there exposed to sufferings and persecution, as we learn from i. 28–30? Were the adversaries of whom the writer tells them not to be afraid Judaising teachers? The context is unfavourable to this opinion. By the *adversaries* is meant all the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles with whom the Philippian converts came into contact—the Jews and Gentiles who resisted the gospel. These Christians had endured a conflict similar to that which Paul had formerly sustained for expelling the demon from the divining damsel, and to his present opposition from Jews, Judaising teachers, and heathen magistrates. But the Philippians resisted their adversaries, and steadfastly adhered to the Pauline doctrine.

There was a tendency in the Philippian character to vain glory and pride, as we infer from ii. 3, 4, 15; iv. 5.

[1] *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi, ein exegetischer Versuch*, 1833.

Their very condition when the apostle addressed them, one of great promise and progress, would be likely to beget spiritual pride.

### OCCASION AND OBJECT.

Epaphroditus's return gave rise to the letter. The object of it is to confirm the believers in the faith, and to encourage them in the Christian life. The writer's affection for them is tender and strong. He opens his heart and pours forth his hopes, desires, anxieties, his fervent wishes for their welfare, and gratitude for their kindness. The epistle is more subjective than any other of Paul's; and richer in expressions of feeling. It has no doctrinal arguments or dialectic reasoning, no citations from the Old Testament or logical plan. His reasoning powers were not needed for confuting error among the Philippians; and therefore the composition is less formal and consecutive; less regular in structure and sequence. There are sudden digressions and breaks in the succession of ideas, especially towards the end. The intimacy subsisting between the writer and his readers furnished free scope for the effusions of his heart; but amid pathos and gentleness he never loses apostolic dignity.

### PECULIARITIES IN THE COMMENCEMENT AND CONCLUSION.

It is contrary to Paul's method to specify *bishops* and *deacons* in the general salutation. The reason may be because they had shown great zeal in procuring a money contribution for the apostle. It is also noticeable that the members of the church are spoken of before the office-bearers, a precedence contrary to modern ideas, especially those of the clergy, who are apt to look on the people as an appendage to themselves. Several bishops are also referred to, which is an evidence

of the epistle's early date, before hierarchical notions exalted one presbyter above the rest and assigned him a separate title. In the apostle's time presbyter and bishop were synonymous. The mention of bishops in the plural agrees with other notices. The church at Ephesus had its elders (Acts xx.). Whether all the apostolic churches had a plurality of pastors is uncertain. They were not similarly organised; nor is their constitution a model for modern churches. Ecclesiastical arrangements belong to the department of expediency.

The commencement does not mention Paul's apostleship. He associates Timothy with himself because the latter had been with him at Philippi; both being termed *bondmen* of Jesus. His omission of the apostolic designation may be partly explained by a motive of delicacy. He avoided the use of a title which might suggest a claim to the benefit he had received. Nor had he any reason for asserting his apostolic authority, since there were no factions in the church and no apostasy from the faith. False teachers had not there impugned his apostleship. Paul did not care for a title, as long as there was no cause for associating it with his name. He waived the higher for the lower appellation.

Lardner observes, that the salutations in the conclusion of the epistle are singular, different from those of the other epistles written about the same time: 'The brethren which are with me greet you;' 'all the saints salute you.' We do not suppose the brethren to be Mark, Aristarchus, Jesus Justus, Demas, and Luke, who had joined the apostle at Rome; nor Euodia, Syntyche, and Epaphroditus; but rather those Christians who were in Paul's immediate circle at Rome, including perhaps Timothy and other fellow-labourers.

Persons belonging to Cæsar's house are particularly mentioned as sending salutations; Cæsar's freedmen and domestics, servants in the palace. It is doubtful whether

any of the emperor's relations are intended, for there is no evidence that his wife Poppæa was a Christian. Neither can Seneca and Lucan be included in the number. Probably the converts were chiefly Jewish slaves; for Josephus states that he was introduced to Poppæa by a Jewish comedian. It would doubtless rejoice the Philippians to hear that Christianity had entered Cæsar's palace, and encourage them to expect the prisoner's release.

CONTENTS.

This epistle is the shortest addressed to any church except the (spurious) second to the Thessalonians. The doctrinal and the practical are not separated, as in other Pauline letters, but are more or less blended throughout. It may be divided into six paragraphs: I. i. 1–11; II. i. 12–ii. 18; III. ii. 19–30; IV. iii. 1–iv. 1; V. iv. 2–9; VI. iv. 10–23.

I. The first part is historical, relating to the writer's condition at Rome. After the inscription and salutation, the apostle expresses his gratitude to God on behalf of the Philippians, his continual mention of them in prayer since they received the gospel, and his confident expectation that the work of peace in their hearts should be carried on to completion. He calls God to witness his deep-seated affection for them, praying that their love and knowledge might be still more abundant, and the fruits of their righteousness more manifest (i. 1–11).

II. That the Philippian believers might not be discouraged at what had befallen him, he tells them that God had overruled his imprisonment for good, making it subserve the advancement of the gospel. His bonds had become known in the prætorium and throughout the city; and several had been induced to preach the gospel more fearlessly by the example of his patient fortitude. Not that the motives of all who proclaimed

Christ crucified were pure, for some envied the apostle; but as long as Christ was preached, Paul rejoiced. He expresses his confidence that the Redeemer should be magnified either by his life or death, though he thinks it more desirable that he should live a little longer, that he might meet them again joyfully. But whatever might be the issue of his present captivity, he exhorts them to lead a holy life, to be firmly united in one spirit, and not terrified by their enemies. In pathetic strains he beseeches them to cultivate mutual love, to avoid vain glory, and to be exceedingly humble in the estimate of their own attainments. To enforce the duty of humility the more impressively, he introduces the example of Christ, who left the glories of the heavenly state to live on earth a life of lowly obedience and suffering. Having referred to Christ's self-abnegation and consequent exaltation, he exhorts them to work out their salvation with fear, remembering that the divine energy was not inactive within them; to avoid murmurings in their sufferings, and disputings for pre-eminence; to be blameless and harmless; and not only to hold fast, but to diffuse, the word of life, that he might rejoice in the day of Christ on their account (i. 12–ii. 18).

III. He promises to send Timothy to them, speaking of him as a disinterested, zealous, affectionate minister, whose excellence was well known. But he expects to be released soon, and to follow Timothy to Philippi. He then gives a reason for sending Epaphroditus in the meantime, mentioning the dangerous sickness of their messenger, his earnest longing to return, and the self-sacrificing fidelity with which he had laboured. Him he commends to their esteem, as a workman worthy of the highest honour (ii. 19–30).

IV. Understanding that there were Judaising teachers at Philippi, the apostle warns his readers against them, affirming that the true people of God are those who put no confidence in conformity to the law. Had this law

furnished ground for glorying, *he* might boast of it; for he was descended from Jewish parents, a rigid Pharisee, observing all legal requirements. But he was willing to forego these pretensions for Christ, while seeking justification by faith in his righteousness alone. His great object was to *know* the Saviour, to become experimentally acquainted with Him in the efficacy of His resurrection, which produces a spiritual resurrection in man and prepares him for glory; to endure like sufferings with Christ, and being united to Him, to attain to a blessed resurrection from sin. He proceeds to describe his Christian experience as progressive, because he aimed at higher attainments in the Christian life, and therefore exhorts them to follow his example by walking after the rule they had already observed. In contrast with his own aims and conduct he places the practices of the Judaisers, whom he describes as enemies of the true doctrine—sensual, unclean, selfish. How unlike them was the apostle of the Gentiles with his citizenship in heaven, who was always looking for the Saviour to raise him to a blessed immortality. The Philippians, having the same faith and prospects, are therefore exhorted to stand fast in the Lord (iii. 1–iv. 1).

V. Paul beseeches Euodia and Syntyche, two females in the church, to be reconciled; entreats his true yokefellow to assist several women in their labours, who had maintained the truth of the gospel along with himself and Clement; and subjoins a few general precepts relating to spiritual joy, moderation, and contentment. Virtue is recommended in the different forms in which the wisdom of ancient philosophers had presented it; and as the Philippians had seen it embodied in himself, they are enjoined to practise it in its widest aspect (iv. 2–9).

VI. He thanks the believers for the signal proof of their kindness to him, but intimates with true delicacy and nobleness of soul, that he had learned to be contented

in whatever circumstances he might be placed; prepared to suffer want if needful, or to have an abundance of the conveniences of life, with an equanimity of temper trained in the school of Christ. After stating that he was more pleased with their gift as an evidence of their Christianity than as a supply of his wants, he encourages them to expect an abundant fulfilment of their desires from God the Father, to whom he ascribes all the glory. The epistle closes with salutations and the usual benediction (iv. 10–23).

# THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

## AUTHORSHIP.

THIS EPISTLE has been assigned to many authors. Some suppose that it was written by Clement of Rome. It is true that it agrees in many places with Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, even to verbal correspondences ;[1] but this proves nothing as long as the latter's authenticity is doubtful. The writer of the letter which bears the name of Clement, borrowed from the treatise addressed to the Hebrews. He wrote in a practical spirit, in language unrhetorical and unperiodic; whereas a speculative character belongs to the epistle to the Hebrews—an Alexandrian tone and colouring which the Clementine author could not have reached.

Others think that it was composed by Barnabas the companion and friend of Paul, on the following grounds :—

(*a.*) Tradition favours this opinion, as Tertullian shows.[2] It is also advocated by Zahn ;[3] but perhaps it does not rest ultimately on tradition but on internal evidence.

(*b.*) The epistle contains traces of Alexandrian

[1] Compare ch. xxxvi. with Hebr. i. 3, etc.; ch. xliii. with Hebr. iii. 2, 5; ch. xvii. with Hebr. iii. 2; ch. xxi. with Hebr. iv. 12; ch. xxvii. with Hebr. vi. 18; ch. ix. with Hebr. xi. 5, 7; ch. x. with Hebr. xi. 8, 9; ch. xii. with Hebr. xi. 33; ch. xlv. with Hebr. xi. 32–40; ch. xix. with Hebr. xii. 1, 2; ch. lvi. with Hebr. xii. 5.

[2] *De Pudicitia*, ch. xx.

[3] In the *Real-Encyklopädie* of Herzog and Plitt, vol. v. p. 668, etc.

gnosis. Barnabas was a Cyprian, and Cyprus was connected with Alexandria in many ways. Perhaps he was himself there. This proves no more than that Barnabas *might have been* the author.

(*c.*) He was a Levite, and therefore well acquainted with the temple worship. Not with the temple at Jerusalem, as Hebr. ix. 1–6 shows ; but he may have been with that at Heliopolis, as Wieseler supposes.[1]

(*d.*) The epistle contains much that is Pauline, and much that is not, which suits a companion of Paul, and one who had some independence at the same time. But the remark would apply to others ; to Apollos better.

(*e.*) The author does not put himself among the immediate hearers of Jesus (ii. 3) ; and we learn from Acts iv. 36, 37, that he was a disciple of the apostles, with which Tertullian agrees. This exegesis is uncertain, because Clement and Eusebius class him among the seventy disciples.

(*f.*) The readers of the epistle assisted the Christians at Jerusalem (vi. 10), which suits Barnabas and Paul (Gal. ii. 10). This presupposes nothing more than a Pauline church in Jerusalem.

(*g.*) The surname of Barnabas, 'son of exhortation,' i.e. of animated prophetic discourse, accords with the expression, 'word of exhortation,' in xiii. 22. But Paul was the spokesman, according to Acts xiv. 12. To this it has been answered that speaking and writing are different things, not necessarily coinciding in the same person.

(*h.*) The position of the epistle in the Peshito or old Syriac version, favours the Barnabas authorship. The letter was not attributed to Paul, else it would not have been put after epistles addressed to private individuals such as Timothy and Titus. Because the framers of the Syrian canon received, besides Paul's thirteen epistles and that to the Hebrews, no more than the epistle of James, the first of Peter and the first of John,

[1] *Eine Untersuchung über d. Hebr. Br.* Erste Hälfte, 1861.

it must be inferred that they assigned our epistle to a man who could rightfully claim the title of *apostle*, which Barnabas is called in the Acts. Besides, Barnabas and Paul founded the Syrian church at Antioch ; and therefore the former could no more be absent from their canon than the latter. Such is Wieseler's reasoning ; but Bleek's still holds good on the other side.[1]

The epistle extant in Barnabas's name cannot be compared with ours, because it was not written by Paul's friend, and its authenticity is generally rejected. The hypothesis which makes Barnabas the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, has no conclusive argument in its favour. Against it is the fact that Barnabas's mission was to the Gentiles, according to Gal. ii. 9 ; which is not fairly met by Wieseler's assumption, that though he had been an esteemed member of the mother church (Acts iv. 36, 37 ; ix. 27 ; xv. 25) he could turn to the Gentile Christians, without necessarily leading us to infer from Gal. ii. 13 that he had afterwards fallen back to a Jewish Christian standpoint.

Others think that Luke had a share in the writing of the epistle, either as translator, or as one that expressed Paul's ideas in Greek. This view is apparently mentioned by Origen ; and is advocated with variations by Hug, Ebrard, Von Döllinger, and Delitzsch. It rests on linguistic grounds mainly. A considerable number of words and phrases unknown to every other New Testament writer, are common to our epistle and Luke's writings. There are also many correspondent constructions. The language of the epistle is tolerably pure. The coincident words and phrases are enumerated by Delitzsch[2] and Lünemann ; the latter giving them in a collected form.[3] But there are important differences of diction and periodic structure, which are opposed to

[1] *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, erste Abtheilung, p. 417, etc.
[2] *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, p. 707.
[3] *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Einleitung, p. 24, etc. Dritte Auflage.

sameness of authorship; so much so, that the identity of the author of Luke's writings with the writer of the epistle to the Colossians might be maintained with equal reason, on the ground of similarity of language between our epistle and the third gospel with the Acts.[1] It should also be remembered that Luke was a Gentile Christian (Coloss. iv. 14), while the epistle evidently proceeded from a Jew by birth, because it is cast in a Jewish mould. Jewish feelings and modes of thought pervade it in a manner which Luke's writings, showing a Hellenic character and culture, do not present. It is therefore improbable that Luke wrote the epistle, though the style of the latter half of the Acts comes near it; the language of the gospel being more remote. Whether Luke was the sole author, as Grotius and Crell believed, or he that put Paul's ideas into a written form; the hypothesis is untenable.

To make the indirectly Pauline authorship more probable, an epilogue is assumed by Delitzsch, from xiii. 18 to the end. Ebrard's epilogue is from xiii. 22 to the end. And it is asserted that Paul allowed the words of ii. 3 to remain, though he could not have written them.

Against the hypothesis that Luke wrote under Paul's sanction, may be urged the fact that the doctrinal ideas and terminology are tolerably independent of the apostle; for though they resemble him in some respects, they differ materially in others. The supposed disciple and writer departed from the master so widely as to form characteristic views of his own.

Another opinion is that Silvanus or Silas was the writer, which is baseless.

A more prevalent view is that Paul was the author, and many arguments are adduced in its favour. External and internal evidence have been summoned to support it. Let us examine the former.

[1] See Köstlin in Zeller's *Theologische Jahrbücher* for 1854, p. 429.

I. The writings of the apostolic fathers are silent on this point. Though several of them show an acquaintance with the epistle, they never mention the author. Clement's letter to the Corinthians has many passages resembling some in ours, as is shown by the parallels which De Wette adduces. Quotations and allusions from Ignatius's epistles were collected by Lardner, and more recently by Forster;[1] but the authenticity of the letters is more than doubtful. Neither is Polycarp a good witness for the Pauline authorship in question, because the passages in the fourth and twelfth chapters of his epistle, cited by Lardner, are too vague. Two places have been pointed out in the epistle of Barnabas; but they are indistinct and uncertain.

The earliest testimony of the Western church, taking that phrase in a sense including Italy, Gaul, and proconsular Africa, is opposed to the Pauline origin. Irenæus († 202) did not attribute it to Paul. This fact rests on the authority of Stephen Gobar, in the sixth century, in a passage preserved by Photius: 'Hippolytus and Irenæus say that the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is not his.'[2] This accounts for the circumstance that Irenæus does not employ it against the Gnostic sects, though it would have suited his purpose. Yet Eusebius states that Irenæus was acquainted with the epistle and spoke of it, along with the Wisdom of Solomon, in a work now lost, quoting some passages from both.[3] Did Irenæus put it on a level with the apocryphal book? It is probable that he used it in a subordinate way, because he did not think it to be Paul's. As to the fragment in which Irenæus is supposed to quote Hebr. xiii. 15, as Paul's, its authenticity is more than doubtful.[4]

Hippolytus (about 200), said to have been a disciple

[1] *The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 599, etc.
[2] *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 232. [3] *Hist. Eccles.* v. 26.
[4] See Irenæus's *Works*, edited by Stieren, vol. i. pp. 854, 855; and vol. ii. p. 381, etc., ed. 1853.

of Irenæus, had the same opinion of the epistle as his master's.

Caius of Rome, at the close of the second and beginning of the third century, held the same view, as we learn from Eusebius.[1] The author of the fragment on the canon published by Muratori, does not enumerate the epistle among Paul's.[2] We suppose that by the epistle 'to the Alexandrians forged in the name of Paul,' he means that to the Hebrews; as Credner, Volkmar, Köstlin, and Wieseler [3] after Semler believe.

Novatian (250) never quotes or alludes to it, though in two treatises of his still extant, it would have been most suitable to his purpose.

Tertullian († 240), denying the Pauline authorship, ascribed the letter to Barnabas, relying, apparently, on a historical tradition current in proconsular Africa. Even when adducing a passage which the Montanists made use of (vi. 4, 5), he assigns the letter to Barnabas;[4] though his interest prompted him to attribute as much authority as he could to the epistle; for the higher its authority, the greater the force of his argument derived from it. Had he known that the epistle was attributed to Paul by early tradition, he would surely have mentioned the circumstance. He states particulars favourable to its credit on the ground of Barnabas's authorship; but if he knew that the catholic Christians rejected or depreciated the letter, he would not have failed to charge them with it. It will not do to say, with Hug, that Tertullian took the epistle for what it was allowed to be by its enemies, and reasoned with such force as to make it, even on this ground, equal to Paul's epistles in value. He was not the man to adopt this course.

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 20.

[2] 'Fertur etiam ad Laudicenses, alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine finctæ, ad hæresem Marcionis et alia plura, quæ in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest. Fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.'

[3] See Wieseler's *Eine Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief*, p. 26, *et seq.*

[4] *De Pudicitia*, c. 20.

Marcion (140) excluded the letter from his canon, for what reason we cannot discover. Having a high regard for Paul, it is likely that he would have adopted the epistle had he thought it to be his. That he might have accepted it as part of his canon is evident from the fact that the Manicheans used the epistle.[1]

Cyprian († 258) speaks of seven churches to which Paul wrote; but does not mention the epistle to the Hebrews, or make any use of it. We infer therefore that he considered it un-Pauline. He generally followed Tertullian.

In several MSS. of the old Latin version, that to the Hebrews is separated from Paul's epistles. Thus in the codd. Claromontanus and Sangermanensis, it is divided from them by a general stichometry of Scripture. But it may be *the epistle of Barnabas* mentioned in the stichometry of the Clermont manuscript; for the African church held the Barnabas authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews. In the cod. Boernerianus it is wanting.

Victorinus of Pannonia († 303) is on the same side of the question. In an extant fragment, he speaks, like Cyprian, of there being seven churches which Paul addressed.[2] If his commentary on the Apocalypse be authentic, he enumerates in it the seven churches, and speaks of epistles to individuals without any notice of the present one. Passages are repeatedly quoted from Paul's epistles; none from that to the Hebrews.

Thus the Pauline authorship was disowned in the West till the beginning of the fourth century—a fact which it is difficult to account for except by supposing that there was no early tradition in Italy, Gaul, and proconsular Africa in favour of Paul's authorship. Hug's attempt to show that the opposition presented to the Montanists, who defended their usage respecting lapsed Christians not being received back into the church by Hebr. vi. 4, 5, led to a denial of the Pauline origin, is unsuccess-

[1] Epiphan. *Hæres.* lxvi. c. 74. [2] *De Exhort. Martyrii*, c. 11.

ful.[1] Catholic Christians did not so readily renounce the authenticity of sacred writings as Hug's reasoning implies; nor is there the least proof that Tertullian and Novatian attached the importance to Hebr. vi. 4, 5, which the critic assumes.

Hilary of Poitiers († 368) was the first writer in the West, as far as we know, who received the letter as Paul's. He was followed by Lucifer († 370), Gaudentius († 410), Ambrose of Milan († 397), and Philastrius of Brescia (387). But doubts still lingered. It is not quoted by Optatus of Milevis (370), by Phœbadius (359), and Vincent of Lerins († 450), in Gaul; nor by Zeno of Verona († 380). Isidore of Seville († 636) says that the authorship was considered doubtful by very many Latin Christians, because of the difference of style.

Jerome († 420) and Augustine († 430) favoured the opinion that it was written by Paul; and the authority of their names contributed to establish it in the West.

The former quotes many passages from the epistle, calling it Paul's, or the apostle's.[2] He also refers to peculiarities distinguishing it from other writings of the same apostle, and gives some explanation of them.[3] At other times, when mentioning or quoting the work he employs expressions of hesitation or doubt, such as, 'if any one is willing to receive that epistle which has been written to the Hebrews, under Paul's name;'[4] 'the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, or whosesoever's you suppose it to be;'[5] 'Paul the apostle speaks, if any one admits the epistle to the Hebrews;'[6] 'whoever he be that wrote the epistle;'[7] 'the apostle Paul, or whatever other person wrote the epistle,' &c.[8]

[1] *Einleitung in die Schriften des neuen Testaments*, zweiter Theil, pp. 412, 413. Vierte Auflage.

[2] *Ep.* 66 *ad Pammach. Adv. Jovinian.* lib. i. 5. *Ep.* 3, 60 *ad Heliodor. Comment. in Esaiam*, c. 5, v. 24; c. 7, v. 14. *In Jerem.* c. 22, v. 1–5. *In Zechar.* c. 3, v. 6, 7. *In Matt.* c. 21, v. 39. *In Gal.* c. 4, v. 3.

[3] *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, c. 5.

[4] *Comment. in Titum*, c. 1, v. 5.

[5] *Comment. in Titum*, c. 2, v. 2.

[6] *In Ezech.* c. 28, v. 11, *et seq.*

[7] *In Amos*, c. 8, v. 7, 8.

[8] *In Jerem.* c. 31, v. 31.

In alluding to the opinion of the Latin church, he says, that many doubt about Paul's authorship ;[1] that the Latin custom was not to receive it among the canonical scriptures ;[2] that all the Greeks admitted it, and some of the Latins ;[3] and that among the Romans even till his time, it was not reckoned Paul's.[4] The longest passage which this father has about it is in a letter to Dardanus, where he states that the epistle 'is received as the apostle Paul's, not only by the churches of the East, but on the other hand by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers ; though most ascribe it to Barnabas or Clement ; and it makes no difference whose it is, since it belongs to an ecclesiastical man, and is read daily in the churches. But if the Latins do not commonly receive it among the canonical scriptures, the Greek churches do the same with the Apocalypse of John. We, however, receive both, not following the usage of the present time, but the authority of ancient writers, who for the most part quote both ; not as they are wont sometimes to quote apocryphal books as canonical.'[5] Here there is an ambiguity in the words '*most* ascribe it to Barnabas or Clement,' but the sense seems to be 'most Greek writers.' We draw the following conclusions from Jerome's writings.

*First.* He believed that Paul did not write the letter, because in speaking of the Greeks he intimates his disagreement with their opinion.

[1] *Comment. in Matt.* c. 26, v. 8, 9.
[2] *In Esaiam*, c. 6, v. 2.
[3] *Ep. 73, ad Evangelum.*
[4] *De Script. Eccles.* c. 59.
[5] 'Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur; et nihil interesse, cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quodsi eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum Apocalypsin Johannis eadem libertate suscipiunt; et tamen nos utraque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent (quippe qui et gentilium litterarum raro utantur exemplis), sed quasi canonicis.'

*Secondly.* Where his language is ambiguous, his caution about orthodoxy was the cause. Careful of his reputation he hesitated where free speaking might have damaged it.

*Thirdly.* The great majority of the Latins did not receive the epistle as Paul's. Only some adopted it.

*Fourthly.* He fully believed in its canonicity; and probably held it to be Paul's *indirectly*.[1]

*Fifthly.* He alleges that most of the Greek writers who received it as Pauline did not ascribe it to him *immediately* but merely through Barnabas or Clement.

Augustine's († 430) sentiments are scarcely consistent. In his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, he alludes to it as *the apostle's*. In his treatise on *Christian Doctrine*, he specifies it as one of the fourteen Pauline epistles. He quotes it as *the apostle's* in his sermons. The decrees of several synods where his influence was considerable, have it after Paul's thirteen letters, as the synod of Hippo (393), and the third of Carthage (397) which attest its canonicity. In the fifth of Carthage (419), it is one of Paul's fourteen letters. In other works of his,[2] it is alluded to as *Scripture*. There are many places in which Augustine avoids giving an opinion about the author, employing indefinite phrases: as, 'the epistle which is written to the Hebrews;' 'which the majority say is Paul's, but some deny;' 'the epistle to the Hebrews;' 'which is inscribed to the Hebrews.' Doubtless he reckoned it a part of the canonical Scriptures, induced to do so, as he affirms, by the authority of the oriental churches; but it is doubtful whether he really believed it to be Paul's. In a passage in his work on 'Christian Doctrine,' where he puts it among the other epistles of Paul, the context makes a distinction between canonical books, assigning greater weight to such as were received by all the catholic

[1] See Wieseler, *Eine Untersuchung*, u.s.w., p. 40, *et seq.*

[2] *Enarrat. in Psalm.* 130, § 12; *Contra Maximin. Arian.* lib. ii. c. 25.

churches than to those adopted by fewer and less important churches.[1] It is not easy to account for the circumlocutory phrases he uses so often, except on the ground of his entertaining doubts about the author. In his later works he avoids quoting the epistle as Paul's. In his work on the 'City of God,' which occupied him fourteen years, he cites it often without naming the writer. And in his unfinished work on Julian, though the latter quotes the epistle as Paul's, Augustine calls it merely 'the epistle to the Hebrews.' 'One would think,' says Lardner, 'that he studiously declines to call it Paul's.' The result of all that Augustine has expressed on the subject is this :—

*First.* He knew the fact that some Latin churches denied the Pauline origin of the epistle.

*Secondly.* He himself sometimes quotes it as the apostle's and was inclined at one time to believe so.

*Thirdly.* Oftener, and particularly in his later writings, he scruples to quote it as Paul's, having doubts about its Pauline origin not its canonicity. These doubts were either not strong enough to induce him to speak directly against the Pauline authorship, or he had not courage to contradict the opinion of the majority. He did not take the side of the minority openly, from want of conviction or from fear.

Rufinus (410) naturally followed Jerome; and every writer of note in the West belonging to the fifth century, took the view ostensibly held by Jerome and Augustine; as Chromatius († 410), Innocent of Rome († 416), Paulinus († 431), Cassian († 450), Prosper (434), Eucherius († 450), Salvian († after 490), and Gelasius († 394). Pelagius (425) wrote on Paul's thirteen epistles, not on that to the Hebrews. Yet he speaks of it as a work of the apostle.

From the beginning of the fifth century, the Pauline authorship was generally acknowledged in the Latin

[1] *De Doctr. Christ.* ii. 12.

church. But even after Jerome and Augustine, several commentators do not quote it, as Leo the Great († 461), and Orosius (420). About the middle of the sixth century, no Latin commentary on it was known to Cassiodorus (470–564).

At Alexandria the case respecting the epistle was different. Though Basilides (about 125) the Gnostic used the Pauline epistles, he rejected that to the Hebrews, because it did not proceed from an apostle of Christ. In the time of Basilides, it was received at Alexandria, but not as Paul's. Pantænus's testimony, inserted by Clement in his lost work *Hypotyposes*, has been preserved by Eusebius.[1] It is generally supposed that 'the blessed presbyter,' whom Clement speaks of, is Pantænus, who obviates an objection to the Pauline authorship from the want of the name. Clement himself asserts († 220), that Paul wrote the epistle in Hebrew and that Luke translated it into Greek.

In like manner, Origen († 254) often employs it as a Pauline writing. One passage may suffice: 'And in the letter to the Hebrews, the same apostle says,' etc.[2] This distinguished father, knowing that individuals and churches questioned its Pauline composition, expresses his purpose to write a distinct discourse in proof of it, in a letter to Africanus. In other places he alludes to doubts respecting its Pauline authorship, as in his comments on Matt. xxiii. 27.

Eusebius († 340) has preserved an extract from Origen's homilies on the epistle to the Hebrews, which gives a more exact account of the Alexandrian father's opinion respecting the origin of the work. Here we have Origen's mature judgment. The homilies were preached and published in the latter part of his life, when he was upwards of sixty years of age. 'The style of the epistle with the title "to the Hebrews" has not

[1] *H. E.* vi. 14.

[2] Καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλός φησιν.—*In Joann.* tom. ii.

that rudeness of speech which belonged to the apostle who confessed himself rude in speech, that is, in phraseology. But the epistle is purer Greek in the texture of its style, as every one will allow who is able to discern differences of style.' Again he says, 'the ideas of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle. Every one will confess the truth of this who reads the apostle's writings attentively.' Afterwards he adds: 'I would say that the sentiments are the apostle's; but the language and composition belong to some one who committed to writing what the apostle said, and reduced into a commentary, as it were, the things spoken by his master. If then, any church receives this epistle as coming from Paul, let it be commended even for this; for it is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote (was the amanuensis of) the epistle, God alone knows certainly. The account that has come down to us is various; some saying that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; others that it was Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.' [1] From this passage we see:—

*First.* That different opinions about the writer of the letter were entertained in Origen's day; doubts about the authorship being so common that he could allude to

[1] *ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς, οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει. Ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφοράς, ὁμολογήσαι ἄν. Πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων. Καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφήσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. Τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων· Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἴποιμ' ἄν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὡσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπό τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλημὴς ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν· ὑπό τινων δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις.—H.E.* vi. 25.

them in a popular discourse, without giving offence or raising suspicions against himself. The words, 'if any church receives it as Paul's, it is even to be commended on that account,' imply that some had doubts of its Pauline authorship. The language is hypothetical; and the inference, that only a few churches received the epistle as Paul's or that any church rejected it as his, cannot be rightly drawn from it.

*Secondly.* Origen's own belief was, that while the sentiments of the epistle proceeded from the apostle, another wrote them down. This explains the apparent inconsistencies observable in his different works. He often cites it as Paul's without scruple or remark; but in his homilies he says, 'God alone knows who wrote it.' The expression 'who wrote the epistle,' can only mean *who put the thoughts into writing, who penned another's ideas. Such* kind of writing some attributed to Clement of Rome, others to Luke; but Origen gives no opinion.[1]

*Thirdly.* It is difficult to understand what he meant by the words, 'ancient men have handed it down to us as Paul's.' He could not mean all the ancients, including Christians in the East and West. Probably he refers to the ancient men of the Alexandrian church, i.e. to Pantænus and Clement, with the generation dependent upon them.

*Fourthly.* There is little doubt that Origen speaks of current traditions which existed before his time; and that their field was Alexandria.

Origen, as we have just seen, believed that Paul was the author of the epistle, and accounted for the diversity of style between it and other Pauline writings by assuming that some one penned the ideas with the apostle's

[1] Unless we make Origen stultify himself in the passage, *τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν* must mean the scribe, rather than the proper author, for the preceding context states that this father believed the thoughts to be Paul's, the recording of them another's.

sanction or by his direction. The power of tradition was so strong that he could not reject Paul's participation in the letter; yet his critical judgment could not reconcile the language with external testimony. Hence he assigned the thoughts to Paul, the diction to another.

Dionysius (248), a disciple of Origen, ascribes the work to the apostle without hesitation, in his epistle addressed to Fabius bishop of Antioch, and preserved by Eusebius.[1] Theognostus of Alexandria (A.D. 282) also assigns the epistle to Paul. So too Peter (300), Alexander (315), Hierax (about 300), Athanasius (†373), Theophilus (†412), Serapion (†358), Didymus (395), and Cyril of Alexandria (†444), employ the epistle, ascribing it to the apostle. The deacon Euthalius (460) again speaks of doubts, which he sets aside. The prevalent opinion of the Alexandrian church was in favour of the Pauline authorship. In accordance with it, the tenth place was usually given to the epistle, i.e. after the second to the Thessalonians. So it is in Athanasius, the council of Laodicea, the Memphitic version, the author of the 'Synopsis of sacred Scripture,' Euthalius and Cyril. Nor was this position confined to the Alexandrian church; other Greek fathers gave it the same place, as Theodoret and Epiphanius; and the oldest Greek MSS., A., B., C., H., agree.

Out of Egypt, in the Greek church, the current tradition of authorship was the same. The council of Nicæa received the epistle as Paul's, which appears from a reply given by Eusebius in the name of the assembled bishops, where it is quoted as his.[2]

Justin Martyr (†166) has several passages which show an acquaintance with the epistle. He writes, for example, 'This is he who, after the order of Melchizedek, is King of Salem, and everlasting priest of the Most

[1] *H. E.* vi. 41.

[2] *καθώς φησι καὶ ὁ Παῦλος τὸ σκεῦος τῆς ἐκλογῆς Ἑβραίοις γράψων, κ.τ.λ* See *Harduin. Acta Concilior.* vol. i. p. 402.

High.'[1] Elsewhere, 'about to be both everlasting priest of God, and King, and Christ.'[2] In another work he writes that Christ is called both Angel and *Apostle*.[3] All that can be inferred from such statements is, that the epistle was current in the Christian circle to which Justin belonged.

Eusebius of Cæsarea quotes the letter very frequently, especially in his commentary on the Psalms, and attributes it to the apostle, putting it among the fourteen and the *Homologoumena*. In the third book of his 'Ecclesiastical History' he says expressly, 'Of Paul there are fourteen epistles, manifest and well known;' subjoining, 'yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging in favour of their opinion, that the church of the Romans denies it to be Paul's.'[4]

In other places the historian speaks differently. Thus he writes: 'For Paul having addressed the Hebrews in their own tongue, some think the evangelist Luke—others, Clement, translated the epistle, which last appears more probable, since there is a great resemblance between the style of the epistle of Clement and the epistle to the Hebrews, as well as between their sentiments.'[5] This passage implies that the writer had an opinion like Origen's, viz. that Paul wrote in Hebrew, Clement translating into Greek. But a statement in his

[1] οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, καὶ αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς Ὑψίστου ὑπάρχων. (Hebr. v. 9, 10; vi. 20; vii. 12.)—*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 379, ed. Thirlby.

[2] καὶ αἰώνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερέα, καὶ βασιλέα, καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι. —*Ibid.* p. 347.

[3] καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος.—*Apol.* i. c. 63, p. 172. Otto, ed. 3.

[4] τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες. Ὅτι γε μήν τινες ἠθετήκασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν.—*H. E.* iii. 3.

[5] Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης ἐγγράφως ὡμιληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλήμεντα . . . . . ἑρμηνεῦσαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφήν· ὃ καὶ μᾶλλον εἴη ἂν ἀληθὲς τῷ τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτῆρα τήν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολήν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι. *H. E.* iii. 38.

commentary on the second Psalm is different, indicating that Paul wrote the epistle in Greek. Elsewhere, he alludes to it as a work belonging to the *Antilegomena* or disputed Scriptures, in the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, because he says, that the latter, in his 'Stromateis,' uses testimonies from the 'Antilegomena,' the book called the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' that of Jesus son of Sirach, the epistle to the Hebrews, Barnabas, Clement, and Jude.

The general conclusion we draw from Eusebius's writings is, that he accepted the epistle as Paul's and used it as such. 'Nevertheless,' says Lardner, 'perhaps it may be questioned whether he was fully persuaded of it.'

The Pauline authorship was commonly held in the Greek church after Eusebius. Cyril of Jerusalem († 389), Gregory of Nazianzum († 390), Basil the Great († 379), the council of Laodicea (363), Gregory Nyssene († after 394), Titus of Bostra († 371), Epiphanius († 402), Chrysostom († 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia († 429), received it. And if the Iambic poem addressed to Seleucus be rightly assigned to Amphilochius of Iconium († 394), he may be also quoted for the Pauline authorship. Gregory Thaumaturgus († about 270) ascribes it to Paul, quoting or referring to various passages, such as ii. 3, 4; iii. 15–18.

As to the Syrian church, the epistle is in the Peshito, but at the end of the Pauline epistles before the general ones. Delitzsch argues that it was put there because anonymous, not because it was thought to proceed from another than Paul.[1] But in that case it would rather have stood among the Pauline ones, between those to the Corinthians and Galatians, or after the Thessalonian ones, certainly before the pastoral epistles. The Peshito has it merely with the title, 'Epistle to the Hebrews.'

[1] *Ueber Verfasser und Leser des Hebräerbriefs*, in Rudelbach und Guericke's *Zeitschrift*, 1849, p. 510.

The later Syriac, which was dependent on the Greek, first gave it the title, 'Epistle of Paul.' After this, the Syrian church generally believed in the Pauline authorship. About the middle of the third century, the synod of Antioch ascribes it to the apostle. Jacob of Nisibis (325), and Ephrem († 378), so quote it, as does Severian bishop of Gabala (401). Isaac bishop of Nineveh († 550), and Ebed-Jesu († 1318), reckon it the fourteenth of Paul's epistles.

This brief summary of the patristic evidence need not be followed further. Those who wish to see it drawn out at length, are referred to Bleek,[1] from whom many succeeding critics have taken their lists of passages.

The following is the result of external evidence on the subject.

In the Western or Latin church, the epistle was not considered apostolic till the fourth century, when it first obtained a canonical position and was assigned to Paul. The causes which contributed to this change cannot be traced. Perhaps the ecclesiastical intercourse between the East and West, which began at the time, brought the sentiments of the former into the latter. Above all, the weight of two names, Jerome and Augustine, greatly influenced the formation of such an opinion. It has been conjectured that the Arian controversy, in which the epistle was useful to the orthodox cause, helped to establish its apostolicity. It may be also, that the study of Origen's writings had its influence. We know that Hilary and Ambrose, in particular, were familiar with them.

In the Eastern or Greek church, tradition was early and uniformly in favour of the Pauline authorship. The Greek fathers, with few exceptions, believed that it proceeded from the apostle of the Gentiles.

The early Syrians did not hold the Pauline author-

[1] *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, erste Abtheilung, viertes Kapitel, p. 81, *et seq.*

ship; but the fathers of that church began to do so in the third century.

Thus patristic evidence is divided and the testimonies conflicting. Taken in the mass, it favours the Pauline origin of the letter. Judged separately, especially in its earliest state, its voice is contrary. If the letter were written in Italy, the Italians must have known whether Paul wrote it or not; and their rejection of it is, consequently, a strong argument against its apostolic authorship. We rely more on the earliest testimony, which is against Paul's authorship, than on the later, and believe that the rejection of that authorship by the Latin church outweighs the opposite evidence. The letter was written either in Italy or at Alexandria; so that the Westerns knew better who wrote it than the Asiatics. It tells against the Pauline origin that Pantænus was the *first* who held that opinion at Alexandria.

II. Having considered the external evidence bearing on Paul's authorship, we proceed to the internal. Here there is much to discountenance the idea that the apostle wrote the epistle.

(*a.*) The want of a title or inscription strikes the reader. The name of the writer does not appear, contrary to Paul's method. As the Jewish Christians were prejudiced against him, he must have appealed, if not to his apostleship, at least to the revelations he had received, the purity of his motives, and his ardent love to his countrymen. Such things would have been most suitable had Paul wished to get a favourable hearing.

At an early period, those who assumed the Pauline authorship endeavoured to account for the absence of the apostle's name by supposing, with Pantænus, that the writer, conscious of his mission to the Gentiles not the Jews, omitted his name through modesty; or with Clemens Alexandrinus, that Paul avoided an inscription lest he should offend the Hebrews who had preju-

dices against him Jerome gives the same explanation as Clement's; which has been repeated till the present day. Hug adds another, viz. that the epistle is a discourse as far as the doxology in xiii. 12, rather than a letter; and therefore a salutation with the apostle's name would have been unsuitable. None of the hypotheses is probable; and the omission of the name at the commencement of the letter remains a strong presumption against the Pauline authorship, especially when it is remembered that Paul did not intrude into the sphere of activity occupied by others (2 Cor. x. 13; Rom. xv. 20). He was the apostle of the Gentiles, not of the Jews.

(*b.*) The manner in which the Old Testament is quoted differs from the Pauline. The writer knows the Jewish Scriptures only in the Septuagint version, which is cited even where it has words added to the Hebrew text, as in i. 6 from Duteronomy xxxii. 43; and also where the meaning of the original is entirely deserted, as in x. 5–7. The author has a few trifling deviations from the Septuagint; but neither in them nor in any other case, not even in x. 30, did he consult the Hebrew. On the other hand, where the Greek version departs *materially* from the Hebrew text, Paul seldom follows it. Again, when the apostle quotes the LXX., his citations commonly agree with the Vatican text, whereas the epistle to the Hebrews uniformly follows the Alexandrian one.[1]

A separate examination of the citations justifies these remarks. Thus i. 7 is from the Septuagint according to the Alexandrian copy, the original Hebrew meaning that God makes the winds his messengers and the lightnings his servants. But in the Greek rendering which our author follows, the sense becomes, 'He makes his angels winds and his servants flames of fire,' imply-

[1] Bleek, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, erste Abtheilung, sections 79–83, pp. 338, 381.

ing that angels are changed into those elements by God to do his pleasure.

The citation in i. 8, 9, from Psalm xlv. 6, 7, is also different in sense from the original, which is, 'thy God's or divine throne is for ever and ever,' referring to a Hebrew king on the occasion of his marriage; whereas the author of the epistle takes the nominative (God) as a vocative, and considers it an address to the Messiah.

The quotation in i. 10–12, from Psalm cii. 25–27, also gives a different meaning from that of the original. The Hebrew words contain an address to Jehovah; the writer of our epistle applies them directly to Christ, misled in all probability by the term κύριε in the LXX., which was commonly applied to Christ in the time of the apostles. Paul would not have made the quotation as it is, applying the words directly to Christ, for the psalm is not Messianic. Jehovah is addressed in it; and no Jew would have used it of the Messiah or of any one except the supreme being. The apostle Paul, educated under Gamaliel, could not have applied the psalm in such a way. In i. 5, v. 5, where words are quoted from the second psalm, they are looked upon as an address of God to the Son in his pre-existent state; whereas Paul considers them as a formula conferring Messianic dignity on Christ at his resurrection (Acts xiii. 33). The former is farther from the Psalmist's meaning, which refers to a statute of Jehovah declared at the inauguration of a theocratic king.

While these and other citations show how dependent the author was upon the Greek translation even where it misinterprets the original, they prove that Paul was not the writer.

In alluding to the author's exegesis connected with Old Testament quotations, we do not forget that the writings of Paul present examples not wholly dissimilar; but the epistle before us has stranger and more numerous specimens, several of which could scarcely

have proceeded from the apostle. We freely allow that the latter spiritualises the Old Testament, allegorises historical accounts, modifies the original sense, and tries to make it prove what it cannot; but with all his deviations from historico-grammatical interpretation, he does not present the peculiar instances of departure in ch. i. 5, 7–12; for he was guided by a sounder judgment than that of the allegorising Alexandrian.

Still further, none of the introductory formulas and quotations so common with Paul, such as, *as it is written*, *for it is written*, *the Scripture saith*, etc. etc., appears in our epistle. Neither are his rarer formulas used, *David says*, *Moses says*, *Isaiah says*. The epistle to the Hebrews refers its citations neither to *Scripture* nor to *persons* or *authors*, but to God or the Holy Spirit, with one exception (ii. 6). This is done even where the words in the original are spoken of God in the third person (Hebrews i. 6, 7, 8, etc.). In cases where the verb *says* has no nominative, *God* should be supplied, not *Scripture*. Only two exceptions occur, viz. ii. 6 and xii. 21, where the indefinite *one* and *Moses said* occur. The former is without example elsewhere. To cite a well-known book like the Psalms with, *some one in a certain place*, is remarkable. The latter is inexact, because the words of Moses in Deut. ix. 19 are transferred to the time when the law was promulgated. We agree with Tholuck in thinking that some passages in the epistle contain reminiscences of Paul's writings, as x. 30, compared with Rom. xii. 19; and xii. 14, compared with Rom. xii. 18.[1]

(*c.*) The writer betrays an imperfect knowledge of the tabernacle and the temple. He is even mistaken in some particulars; a thing that could not be asserted of Paul, who lived in Jerusalem for a considerable time. In the 9th chapter, the Jewish tabernacle is divided into its two principal parts; the first apartment and

[1] *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*, Einleitung, p. 46, 2nd ed.

the holy of holies. In specifying their furniture the author mentions, in the first, the candlestick, the table, and the shew-bread; in the second, the golden altar of incense, with the ark of the covenant containing the pot of manna, Aaron's rod, and the tables of stone.

The pot of manna and Aaron's rod are put in the ark of the covenant, which is opposed to 1 Kings viii. 9; 2 Chron. v. 10, where it is expressly declared that the ark had nothing in it but two tables of stone. And the golden altar of incense is put in the holy of holies; whereas it was in the first apartment, towards the veil that separated the one from the other.

In the tabernacle, Aaron's rod and the pot of manna were *before*, not *in* the ark (Exod. xvi. 33; Numb. xvii. 10); with which both Josephus and Philo agree when they relate that the ark contained nothing but the tables of stone. But the later Rabbins, Levi ben Gerson and Abarbanel, have the same view as that in the epistle, so that the author may have followed a tradition different from the Scriptural one. The word translated *altar of incense* is ambiguous, and may mean *censer*. We prefer the former meaning, because it is sanctioned by the authority of Josephus and Philo. In either case, there is an error, since we learn from the Mishna that the censer was *taken into* the holy of holies by the high priest, not *kept* there. The whole passage shows, that though the writer had respect to the tabernacle, he transferred both divisions of it, with all the furniture, to the temple of his own day, which he believed to possess the ark, the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod. What belonged to the original tabernacle he supposed to have equally belonged to the temple of his time. The present tense used in the sixth verse (the priests *enter in*), and in the seventh (*offers*), along with the present perfect (these things *having been* thus *ordained*, ix. 6), reads as if the arrangements of the tabernacle existed. Similarly, ignorance on the part of

the writer appears in ix. 19, where it is a mistake to say that the blood of the sacrifices was mixed with water. The blood would have been vitiated by the addition of water, except in accidental cases. So also the statement that the tabernacle was sprinked with blood (ix. 21) is incorrect. It was sprinkled with oil, as we learn from the Old Testament.

But it cannot be said that the writer has made a mistake about the high priest offering *daily* sacrifice, for vii. 27 does not sustain that position; yet the adverbial *daily* is so vague, that the statement cannot be entirely justified by the references to Josephus, the Talmud, and Philo which Bleek advances. The author, thinking of the daily offerings of the priests, as well as the yearly sacrifice of atonement, uses language involving their amalgamation.

(*d.*) According to ii. 3, the writer was not an apostle, but had received the gospel from ear-witnesses. 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and *was confirmed unto us by them that heard him*?' Here the readers are represented as belonging to the second Christian generation, because they had received the gospel from ear-witnesses and the first preachers. The author classes himself with the readers—'was confirmed unto *us* by them that heard him.'

The only way of escaping the force of this argument is to call in the aid of a rhetorical figure,[1] by which the writer includes himself among those he addresses. Such a mode of speaking does occur in the epistle, and in the Pauline letters. But Bleek rightly limits it to hortatory addresses, where an author may include himself with propriety among his readers, because the consciousness of moral infirmity is an attribute of universal humanity. Although therefore the context has, '*we* ought to give heed,' 'how shall *we* escape?' the

[1] Called ἀνακοίνωσις.

figure is dropped when a historical fact is expressed. It is difficult to see how Paul could forbear in that passage to remind the Jewish Christians that the Lord himself had worked and taught in their midst, had suffered before their eyes, and found the first witnesses of his resurrection and ascension among them.

(*e.*) The hermeneutical principles of the epistle differ from Paul's. In allegorising the Old Testament, the author goes much further than the apostle, who treats single passages in that way, as in Galat. iii. 16 and iv. 22, etc.; the latter being the most conspicuous instance in his writings. Our author spiritualises the person of Melchizedek, whom he considers a type of the Son of God. The history of this priest in Genesis is viewed typically; all that is said of him, down to the very name, and all that is not said of him, being significant. Such interpretation reminds us of Philo and the Rabbins.

Akin to allegorising is the play upon words, of which there is a notable example in the use of the Greek term translated *covenant* (ix. 15–18), which has also the meaning of *testament*, and is used as the basis of an argument for the sacrificial death of Christ.

(*f.*) The doctrinal system of the epistle to the Hebrews, though based upon Paulinism, is worked out in a different way and assumes another form. The Alexandrine education of the writer shaped and modified the Pauline teaching which was the point of his departure. Though he has advanced in some respects beyond Paul, with independence and originality; yet his conclusions are for the most part substantially the same. It was not his object to diverge from the Pauline doctrine, but to establish it, which he does in his own method. The view of Christianity and Judaism is determined by the Alexandrine conception of the supersensuous world which is prominent in Philo. When Christianity is identified with that abstract world of thought it receives a new form, and its blessings assume a peculiar aspect.

The idea of transcendence enters into them. Christianity is a transcendent reality because it is the archetypal world, the heavenly Jerusalem, of which believers are the citizens. Raised far above the earthly and temporal, it is the heavenly and perfect world. But the perfect is something future, a thing that cannot now be actually possessed. Hence Christianity is identical with the future world. It is *the world to come* in point of time, as it is *the heavenly world* in respect to place, transcendent therefore both in place and time. The present world or æon was that which preceded Christianity; the future world or æon is that of Christianity itself, which Christ came to inaugurate and open up. The two are metaphysically opposed to one another; and as Christianity is absolutely different from the earthly world, its blessings are the object of hope rather than a present possession. The Christian can only *taste of its powers* on earth.

(*a.*) Judaism is a Levitical cult; and both its temporary and perpetual character—its transience and unchangeableness—lie in that fact. When it is changed, the law is changed with it. Priesthood is the primary, law the secondary thing; the former determining the latter. Because priesthood is changed, the law must be changed, the one being subordinate to the other. When the incomplete priesthood is fulfilled, the law cannot continue, as it was a weak and profitless thing. The view taken by Paul is different. He considers Judaism as a law not as a priesthood; a law which has to be fulfilled. The Pauline view of Judaism is subjective; that of our epistle, objective. Paul shows that the law cannot bring man into a right relation to God because he is unable to fulfil it; the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, that the priestly arrangements in the Old Testament cannot effect reconciliation to God because of their defective character. According to Paul, the ground of Judaism being unsatisfactory does not lie in the law but in man's relation to it; according to our author, the

ground is in the constitution of Judaism itself. As Paul apprehended Judaism from the standpoint of the law, and the author of our epistle from that of its ritual, they arrive at its abolition in different methods. Judaism was a shadow of which Christianity is the substance. As it was a copy of the heavenly sanctuary or Christianity, the latter, being eternal, really preceded it. The essence was anticipated in the shadow. Hence its temporary validity. Belonging to the earthly and perishing world, to the *αἰὼν οὗτος*, it was only a preparation for the perfect thing to come. Such is the view of our epistle. Paul looks upon Judaism as having been abolished by the death of Christ, who fulfilled the law and bore its curse on the cross. With him Judaism was not a copy of Christianity, but a legal institution opposed to it.

The epistle announces, for the first time, the priesthood of Christ as typified by the high priesthood of the old covenant. The sacrifice he offers for sin is himself, so that he is both priest and victim. This is not Pauline; and it also clashes with the Old Testament idea of the Messiah, who is not a priest but a king.

The relation between Jewish and Gentile Christians under the New Testament is also looked at differently by Paul and the writer of this epistle. The former does not make Jewish Christians the proper nucleus and body of the Church, but Gentile ones; the latter, who never mentions Gentile Christians, must have considered Jewish believers the essential portion of the Church.[1]

(*β.*) The christology of our epistle, though similar, advances beyond the Pauline, occupying an intermediate position between the Pauline and Johannine. Both Paul and our author represent Christ as pre-existent and superhuman; but the latter gives him a higher rank in that he is an effulgence of the divine glory and an express image of the divine substance. His nature is

[1] See Riehm's *Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, p. 232, *et seq.*

the same as God's, and metaphysically connected with it. Omnipotence itself is ascribed to him when it is said that he upholds all things by the word of his power; and the language descriptive of Jehovah (in Psalm cii.) is directly applied to him as though he were the eternal creator of the universe. Thus Christ's person is elevated into a cosmical principle, as in the epistle to the Colossians. He is not yet, however, the Logos of John. But he is a higher pre-existing being than in the epistles of Paul, for in the latter he is still a heavenly man, the archetype of humanity; whereas in the former he is a purely divine being with an independent existence. According to Paul, he ultimately delivers up the dominion to the Father; in the epistle to the Hebrews his dominion is everlasting. The view of Pfleiderer is highly probable, that the christological passage in i. 3 rests upon the description of *sophia* or *wisdom* in the Alexandrine book of Wisdom (vii. 25–27); which describes it as the personified power of the Almighty.[1]

(γ.) Reconciliation to God by the death of Christ is differently set forth. The apostle looks upon the Son as passive rather than active; his sacrifice as a vicarious one, satisfying the justice of God and taking away the punishment of sin. In the epistle, Christ is an active high priest offering up himself. The death of the victim in the one case is connected with the removal of the divine wrath; in the other, with the removal of the consciousness of guilt; for by the offering up of Christ once for all the conscience is *purified*, disquieting fears cease, and the Christian enters into communion with God. The Pauline idea of the death is an expiatory sacrifice offered to the justice of God manifested in the law; that of the epistle is a sacrifice of *purification*. In the former, the immediate effect is deliverance from deserved punishment and acceptance as righteous because of imputed righteousness; in the latter, it is deliverance

[1] See Pfleiderer's *Paulinismus*, vol. ii. p. 61, English translation.

from a guilty conscience. Thus reconciliation to God is differently apprehended by the two writers.

The epistle does not connect the work of Christ with his death on the cross, but with his appearance in the heavenly sanctuary, where he discharges his priestly duties, interceding with the Father for his people. The proper efficacy of his priesthood does not begin till he is *perfected*.

(δ.) The Pauline contrast of *faith* and *the law* or *the works of the law* is foreign to our epistle. According to the apostle, faith is the inward appropriation of Christ's righteousness, a righteousness imputed to the believer through that medium. It rests on Christ as its object, especially on his death and resurrection. According to the epistle, the object of faith is the invisible world, viewed both as a reality and a future possession. Hope is an element of faith, not a consequence of it, as it is with Paul. Christ, instead of being the object of faith, has perfected it, brought it into full manifestation in himself, so as to be the guide of all who follow his steps. He is the perfect illustration of all that it is and expresses; the great forerunner in the road of faith. The Pauline view is that faith puts the Christian into a mystical union with Christ. Believers live, die, rise with him. Christ is *in* them and they *in* Christ. The epistle sets forth Christ *for* us not *in* us; Christ as our great example, the mediator of a new covenant, who having passed through sufferings and death into the heavenly sanctuary opened up full communion with God. He is the great high priest who is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him.

The righteousness *according to faith* (xi.7) is also different from the Pauline *righteousness of faith* (ep. to Romans ix. 30). The former is the state of mind which faith produces, that is righteousness of character. It is the consequence of faith. The latter is a thing imputed by God to the sinner and received by faith, in other words,

a divine gift. The one represents righteousness as a property inherent in the believer, manifested in his actions and sufferings, recognised by God; the other looks upon it as a thing which God bestows. The epistle ignores the legal way in which Paul sets forth justification. Ideas and forms of expression resulting from the judicial standpoint of the apostle are dropped; and thoughts according with an Alexandrine standpoint are attached to his language.

(ε.) The Pauline idea that Christ is the first member of a renewed humanity, the second Adam, is not in our epistle. On the other hand, he is called by the present writer 'the apostle and high priest of our profession,' epithets unknown to Paul.

(ζ.) The writer is silent as to the power which sin has over men according to Paul, making it impossible for them to fulfil the law; with the misery and condemnation in which mankind are on that account. He never speaks of the power of the flesh over the spirit, or of the impossibility of performing works that justify; but rather proceeds on the principle of the freedom of the human will, and the divine reward of good conduct (xiii. 16; vi. 10).

(η.) The relation of the work of redemption to the devil is absent in Paul's teaching. In our epistle, Christ is said to have overcome him that had the power of death; in other words, his redeeming efficacy freed men from one that wielded the power of bodily death. Death is the punishment of sin; and man is continually subject to the fear of it. It is Satan who has the power of carrying out the penalty; and Christ in overcoming him freed man from the fear of death, or rather from the fear of the judgment that follows it. Paul views the death of Christ in its relation to the punitive justice of God; the writer of the epistle, in relation to the devil who executes it. Christ and the devil are two opposing powers. When the latter is vanquished by the death of the for-

mer, man is liberated from the bondage of terror, his guilty conscience is purified; in a word, he is redeemed.[1]

Paul does not represent Christ as the prince of death, but the god of this world. *Sammael* had similar power over death, according to the later Jews.[2]

(*θ.*) The passage v. 7–9 is wholly unlike Paul's teaching. When and where were these prayers uttered? They cannot be explained by the exclamation on the cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' Nor are the utterances in the garden of Gethsemane exactly suitable, because 'the strong crying and tears' are absent from the gospel record. Were the prayers in question answered? If they were, as the passage implies, his death is contrary to that. The answer, however, may have been in his being strengthened for the endurance of suffering. The passage is un-Pauline throughout, especially the statement that though he was a son he learned obedience by the things he suffered, and was perfected.

(*ι.*) In vi. 2, the doctrine of the resurrection is put among the elementary principles of the gospel. This is opposed to Paul's teaching in the first epistle to the Corinthians, where great importance is attached to the doctrine. In vi. 4–6, the impossibility of restoring such as had lapsed after they had been baptized is a Novatian tenet, which is out of harmony with Paul's general belief.

Notwithstanding the diversities between the characteristic doctrines of Paul and the writer of our epistle, the latter was a Pauline Christian, who had imbibed the liberalism of the great apostle and was acquainted with his letters; for he has plain reminiscences of them. Passages corresponding to others in the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians present themselves to the eye of the reader.[3] Deuteronomy xxxii. 35 is quoted in the

[1] See Pfleiderer's *Paulinismus*, vol. ii. p. 78, English translation.

[2] See Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chald. Talm. Rabbin.* p. 1495.

[3] Comp. xi. 12 with Romans iv. 18; xii. 14 with Romans xii. 18, xiv. 19;

form which it has in the epistle to the Romans, not as in the Septuagint. Yet Paul and our author do not move entirely within the same circle of ideas. The latter develops those of the former from another point of view, and proceeds in an independent direction. He represents Alexandrine Paulinism, and exhibits great originality. His treatise, pervaded by the Philonian dualism of the supersensuous and sensuous worlds, presents the idea of *transcendence* not *imminence*. Hence the contrast between archetype and type, substance and shadow, the future and the present world, the heavenly and the earthly, the unchangeable and the transient, the real and the unreal; between Judaism and Christianity.

It is instructive to compare the epistle not only with Paul's writings but with the fourth gospel. Though it forms an intermediate link, its Alexandrine mould brings it nearer the latter.

(*g*) It was early felt that the phraseology and style of the epistle are different from Paul's. Hence Clement thought that the work was translated. For the same reason Origen attributes the thoughts to Paul; the dress they are clothed in, to another. This distinguished father, who was no mean judge of Greek as may be gathered from different parts of his writings, believed that the Greek of the epistle is better than Paul's, appealing to every judge; and his opinion has been ratified by the most eminent scholars.

Stuart collected a catalogue of Hebraisms to show what none disputes, that the language of the epistle is far from being classical. It is beside the mark to quote religious terms which have been transferred from the Old Testament into the theological language of every nation as well as into the Greek tongue. The dissentients from Origen's opinion should prove that the

xiii. 1 with Romans xii. 10; xiii. 2 with Romans xii. 13; xiii. 20 with Romans xv. 33; v. 12 with 1 Cor. iii. 2; v. 14 with 1 Cor. ii. 6. See Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, ix. 4, etc.

author of the epistle to the Hebrews has employed Hebraistic expressions as symbols of ideas for which the Greek language has more appropriate words of its own. When this shall have been done from a lexical point of view, something effective will be accomplished; till then, an industrious array of Hebraisms is useless. We do not maintain that the language of the epistle is free from Hebraisms, but that the diction is purer than Paul's. In respect to purity, it stands on a level with the latter half of the Acts, where many of the expressions quoted by Stuart from the epistle to the Hebrews as Hebraisms are also found. Tried by his mode of procedure, any of Paul's epistles not only presents as many Hebraisms as that addressed to the Hebrews, but would exhibit far more if a parallel could be found among them, viz. a letter addressed solely to Jewish Christians and occupied with a description of the Jewish economy in relation to the Christian system. The subject itself might induce more Hebraisms than any treated by Paul; yet the epistle has really fewer.

All the *grammatical* Hebraisms in the epistle are these: the genitive of a substantive along with another substantive, in place of an adjective, as in i. 3; iv. 2; v. 13; vi. 1; and the undeclining of foreign names, as Aaron, vii. 11; ix. 4; Cherubim, ix. 5; Jericho, xi. 30; Jerusalem, xii. 22.

The following are all the examples of a *lexical* kind which occur: λαλέω applied to divine disclosures, i. 1; ii. 2; ix. 19—*γεύομαι θανάτου*, ii. 9—*σπέρμα* for *posterity*, ii. 16; xi. 18—*σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* for *corporeity*, ii. 14—*παῤῥησία*, *confidence*, iii. 6; iv. 16; x. 19, 35—*χάριν εὑρίσκειν*, iv. 16—*ὁμολογία*, *faith professed*, iii. 1—*εὐλογία*, *blessing*, vi. 7; xii. 17—*τὸ ὄνομα Θεοῦ*, a periphrasis for God himself—*οἰκτιρμοί*, x. 28—*ἐγκαινίζειν*, ix. 18; x. 20—*ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην*, xi. 33—*ὁλοθρεύω*, xi. 28—*ὁμολογεῖν τινι*, xiii. 15—*ῥῆμα*, *promise*, vi. 5—*ἐξέρχομαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος*, vii. 5—*ἰδεῖν θάνατον*, xi. 5—

οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, xi. 5—μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον, xii. 19—περιπατέω ἐν, xiii. 9—καρπὸς χειλέων, xiii. 15—ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ, xiii. 21—κοπή, ουεχthrow, vii. 1—καρπὸς εἰρηνικός, xii. 11.

In a *syntactical* respect, we have the Hebraising constructions ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ instead of the genitive, iii. 12—λαλεῖν ἐν for διά, i. 1—ὄμνυμι κατά τινος, vi. 13—καταπαύειν intrans. with ἀπό, iv. 10; εἶναι εἴς τι, viii. 10—ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας instead of τὸν Θεόν, ii. 17.

The following list of peculiarities is De Wette's, revised and sifted.

Different formulas introductory to quotations: λέγει, μαρτυρεῖ, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον or Θεός; or merely λέγει, εἴρηκε, μαρτυρεῖ, φησί, i. 5, 6, etc., 13; iii. 7, 15; iv. 3, 4, etc., 7; v. 5, etc.; vi. 14; vii. 14, 17, 21; viii. 5, 8, 13; x. 5, 8, 9, 15, etc., 30; xi. 18; xii. 5, 20, 26. Paul has γέγραπται, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, ἐγράφη, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος; or Μωϋσῆς γράφει, Δαβὶδ λέγει, ὁ νόμος λέγει and such like. Only Ephes. iv. 8, and v. 14, are like the epistle to the Hebrews. Rom. xv. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16, are somewhat similar.

The characteristic expression applied to Christ by Paul is ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Χριστός Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν; but the epistle to the Hebrews has only the single appellations ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ κύριος, Χριστός—Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς three times, and ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς once. The compound appellations are characteristic of Paul; the single ones of the epistle to the Hebrews. It may be correct, as Stuart asserts, that those compound formulas occur but sixty-eight times in all the Pauline letters; but even so, we naturally expect appellations compounded with κύριος oftener than they appear in our epistle. It has only one such, while there are seventeen, at least, in the epistle to the Romans. Again, *Jesus* occurs seven times in our epistle; whereas in that to the Romans, which is longer,

it is found but twice; and in the first epistle to the Corinthians once. These facts tell against the Pauline authorship. *Apostle* is applied to Christ, iii. 1—*μισθαποδοσία*, ii. 2; x. 35; xi. 26—*μισθὸς* in Paul—*ὁρκωμοσία*, vii. 20, 21—*αἱματεκχυσία*, ix. 22—*οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα*, ii. 5—*τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά*, ix. 11; x. 1—*μέτοχον εἶναι, γίνεσθαι*, iii. 1, 14; vi. 4; xii. 8; but Paul has *κοινωνόν, συγκοινωνὸν εἶναι, κοινωνεῖν, συγκοινωνεῖν*—*ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*, i. 3—*ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, viii. 1—*ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, xii. 2; *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, x. 12; in Coloss. *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος*. The writer of our epistle uses the verb *καθίζω* intransitively; whereas, with a similar context, Paul uses it transitively. The former says, Christ sat down on the right hand of the throne of the majesty, etc. etc.; whereas the apostle of the Gentiles says, 'God the Father seated him at his own right hand,' etc. *ἡγούμενοι*, xiii. 7, 17, 24—*κακουχεῖσθαι*, xi. 37; xiii. 3—*συνκακουχεῖσθαι*, xi. 25—*θρόνος τῆς μεγαλωσύνης*, viii. 1—*θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*, iv. 16—*τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίζειν*, x. 29—*τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατεῖν*, x. 29. Nouns feminine in *ις* are numerous, as *ἀθέτησις*, vii. 18; ix. 26—*μετάθεσις*, vii. 12; xi. 5; xii. 27—*κατάπαυσις*, iii. 11, 18; iv. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, etc. etc.—*τελειοῦν*, ii. 10; v. 9; vii. 19, 28; ix. 9; x. 1, 14; xi. 40; xii. 23—*τελείωσις*, vii. 11—*λαμβάνειν* used in a peculiar way with the accusative, as *πεῖραν, ἀρχὴν λαμβάνειν*, xi. 29, 36; ii. 3. It is irrelevant to heap together a number of accusatives with the same verb, in Paul's writings, as Stuart has done; because in such instances the verb is not employed in the same manner. *προσέρχεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ*, iv. 16; vii. 25; x. 1, 22; xi. 6. *κρείττων* in a peculiar sense, *more excellent*, i. 4; vi. 9; vii. 7, 19, 22; viii. 6; ix. 23; x. 34; xi. 16, 35, 40. One doubtful example of the adjective with the same meaning in Paul's thirteen epistles (1 Cor. xii. 31) leaves the fre-

quency of its peculiar usage in the epistle to the Hebrews untouched. εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, vii. 3 ; x. 1, 12, 14—εἰς τὸ παντελές, vii. 25—διαπαντός, ix. 6 ; xiii. 15 ; *living God*, *living word*, *living way*, iii. 12 ; ix. 14 ; x. 31 ; xii. 22 ; iv. 12 ; x. 20—ἐάνπερ, iii. 6, 14 ; vi. 3—the frequently occurring ὅθεν, ὅσον, τοσοῦτο, ἀδύνατον—παρὰ after the comparative, i. 4 ; ix. 23 ; xi. 4 ; xii. 24 ; the frequent use of πᾶς in the singular.

The opponents of the Pauline authorship do not now insist upon the number of words which are only found in the epistle to the Hebrews ; because, though there are 118 such, there are 230 in the first epistle to the Corinthians. The argument is valid only within certain limits. Such as were chosen to suit the rhetorical character of the epistle, or arose out of the author's characteristic circle of ideas, are in point.

Every reader feels that the style is unlike Paul's. The periods are regular and rounded ; the rhythm oratorical and smooth. The structure of sentences is more exact than the Pauline ; with less abruptness and vigour. Full-toned expressions, words of a poetical complexion, are abundant. Instead of the apostle's dialectic method, his fiery energy and impassioned style, we have the stately and polished eloquence of one who built up rhythmical periods. This oratorical character has influenced the choice of single words and phrases ; though it is not seen in them as much as in the conformation and succession of sentences. In the case of single words, it appears in the use of less common in preference to colloquial ones ; whose quality, not their number, gives them a voice against the Pauline authorship. Thus *effulgence* and *express image* (i. 3) are employed, instead of *image of God* ; and such full-toned poetical words as μισθαποδοσία for μισθός, μεγαλωσύνη (not μέγεθος), ὁρκωμοσία, αἱματεκχυσία, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, κ.τ.λ.

Greek particles are used in our epistle with greater

copiousness and variety than in any of Paul's of equal length. Thus τε usually followed by καὶ occurs nineteen times ; whereas in the epistle to the Romans, containing three chapters more than ours, it appears but thirteen times ; and in first Corinthians only four times. It is remarkable how often γὰρ is used, even where other conjunctions might have been more appropriate. The use of ἀλλά before a negative question is singular (iii. 16) ; no example of it occurring in the epistle to the Romans. So too the employment of εἶτα in the progress of an argument (xii. 9), and of δήπου (ii. 16).

The care observable in the conformation of sentences has been often noticed. The author studied euphony and rhetorical effect. This is exemplified in the first three verses of the epistle, where there is the music of poetry, with its stately dignity and full-toned utterance. Another example is conspicuous in vii. 4, where the position of the word *patriarch*, which Paul never uses, gives a fine effect to the sentence. Instances may also be seen in xii. 1, 2 ; vi. 4–6 ; v. 7–10 ; vii. 22 ; ix. 11, 12.

While the writer of our epistle abounds in participial constructions, he keeps them from embarrassing the simplicity and regularity of his periods, which they often do in Paul's epistles.

We find the two correspondent clauses (protasis and apodosis) of a sentence which contribute to the rounding of periods. Compare ii. 2–4, 14, 15 ; ix. 13, 14. There are no anomalies (anacolutha) so frequent in Paul. Long parentheses, with shorter ones thrown into their midst as the impassioned spirit of the great apostle hurries forward piling clause on clause, do not turn the construction aside from the method of its commencement. The sentences are not marked by interruptions, inversions, involutions. The calmness of the writer prevents such ruggedness. Bleek quotes a striking example from xii. 18–24, where, though there

is a long parenthesis enclosing a shorter, the thread of discourse is continued without departure from the right construction. Compare also vii. 20–22; v. 7–10; xii. 1, 2. The only apparent exceptions are in ii. 9 and iii. 15.

What is the conclusion to be drawn from style? If the tone of the writer be elevated, rhetorical, polished, is it not unlike Paul's? Let it be admitted that the apostle's style varies in his epistles; the dissimilarity here observable is not explained by that; because the diversity which appears in his writings is compatible with substantial unity. Let it also be admitted that Paul's relation to the Palestinian Christians differed from his relation to other believers, because he was not one of their teachers. Yet he did not found the Roman church; and the style of the epistle addressed to it is very different from that of the present. The object he had in view and the subject discussed will not explain the elevated tone; these did not need a loftier diction than the subjects of some Pauline epistles. The contents of the letter to the Romans demanded an equally oratorical style. If it be thought that because the epistle resembles a treatise on a great subject it should be dignified, calm, and solemn; yet Paul's fire does not burst forth even in the hortatory part, where no trace of his characteristic manner appears. And is it not strange that the apostle should adopt a purer Greek and higher style of writing in an epistle addressed to Jewish Christians—to readers who were the worst judges of good Greek? Had they been cultivated Gentiles, an elegant tone would have been appropriate; why polish the diction and round the periods for the use of Jewish believers? We are therefore brought to the conclusion, that the apostle Paul did not write the letter.

A few expressions almost look as if the writer wished to personate Paul. In xiii. 19 he desires his

readers to pray that he may be restored to them ; and says that his brother Timothy having been set at liberty, he should come with him to see them (ver. 23). But they are too small to justify the opinion that the author puts himself in Paul's place. The main doctrine which runs through the epistle, the priesthood of Christ, puts Pauline authorship away.

These arguments cannot be overthrown by attempts to find parallels between the language of this epistle and of those written by the apostle. De Groot [1] adduces a great array of passages in our epistle and the Pauline writings, where the same or synonymous words are employed ; or where the shade of thought is peculiar and homogeneous, though the language be somewhat different. With the same object, Forster has given lists of words in the Septuagint or apocrypha, which occur only in Paul's epistles and that to the Hebrews ; of words not in the Septuagint or apocrypha found only in the two classes of writings ; and of words occasionally occurring elsewhere in the New Testament, but peculiar in the manner or frequency of their occurrence to the epistles compared. Other linguistic parallels are gathered by Stuart and Biesenthal. Such reasoning is delusive, because some similarity of ideas and diction is not denied. That similarity, however, is weakened by the fact that the internal relation of the epistle to the Pauline writings is scarcely so great as the likeness between it and Peter's first epistle. It is the diversity amid similarity which makes a different writer probable ; the characteristic conceptions and terminology indicating an independent author. The Christian who wrote our epistle, being familiar with Paul's writings, must necessarily present some agreement with the apostle ; as a distinct person living in another intellectual atmosphere, he exhibits features not Pauline—lines of thought

[1] *Disputatio qua epistola ad Hebræos cum Paulinis epistolis comparatur.* 1826, 8vo.

and modes of expression betraying an Alexandrian spiritualism.

How then does the matter stand with regard to the Pauline authorship? Is ecclesiastical tradition on the one side and internal evidence on the other? Early tradition is divided on the subject, the West and East disagreeing. Oriental tradition itself is not unanimous before the fourth century; nor did the Western unite in a Pauline authorship before the fifth. Internal evidence, combined with the early Western scepticism, outweighs the tradition of the Eastern church. If it be said that the very difficulties of style, phraseology, etc., presented by the epistle increase the force of the external testimony, since nothing but a thoroughly authentic tradition could have maintained itself against these difficulties, we reply, that the difficulties changed the tradition by compelling the writers who followed it to resort to an *indirect* Pauline authorship. So far from enhancing, they weaken the strength of the external evidence by the hypothesis that the thoughts are Paul's, the composition and language another's.

The Pauline authorship has been given up by every scholar except Hofmann, whose conjectures about Paul being freed from his Roman captivity and going to Brundusium, whence he sent the letter to Antioch, will not be accepted. Another writer must be sought; and here the sagacity of Luther in ascribing the authorship to Apollos strikes every reader.

This view, which accounts both for the similarity and dissimilarity of the doctrine to Paul's, harmonises all the phenomena of the epistle. Though Apollos was a friend of the apostle, he occupied so independent a position as to be made the head of a party in the Corinthian church. The allegorising character of the epistle, its typification of the Old Testament, its familiarity with the Septuagint, its accord with Alexandrian philosophy, suit Apollos. We see that the author's acquain-

tance with the Old Testament was derived entirely from the Greek version, that he knew little of the Hebrew text, and that there is a great resemblance between his work and Philo's writings in reasoning, ideas, phrases and words. As Apollos was an Alexandrian Jew, an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, he might well write the epistle. In any case, no Palestinian was so imperfectly acquainted with the arrangement of the temple; none viewed the Old Testament institutions as shadowy emblems of Christianity; disregarding the letter for the spirit, or rather extracting a hidden sense which set aside the original and historical one. This Philonian method argues a style of thought moulded by Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy in the first century of our era. The writer either read Philo, or was imbued with the spirit of his teaching. The probability that Apollos wrote the epistle is not weakened by Delitzsch's assertion of the near relationship which Paul's acknowledged letters bear to Philo's Alexandrianism;[1] because that relationship is distant in comparison with ours. Neither is it set aside by the fact that Clement of Rome, writing to the Corinthians and using the epistle to the Hebrews, does not designate the latter as the production of their former teacher Apollos; or by the silence of the ancient church with respect to the Apollos-hypothesis.[2] External evidence on this point cannot avail against internal grounds. If it did, we should believe that the apostle Paul was the writer, either directly in his own person, or through the medium of another; a hypothesis which all good critics reject.

It is not necessary to show how much of Philo's peculiar style and sentiment was owing to his Jewish, and how much to his Alexandrian, habits of thought. The advocates of the epistle's Alexandrian authorship should

[1] *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*, Einleit. pp. xxvi. xxvii.
[2] Wieseler's *Eine Untersuchung, u. s. w.*, p. 69.

not be asked to do an impossible thing. It is sufficient for them to make it as probable as the nature of the case allows, that a Christian Jew of Alexandria was the author. We do not say that a Jew who had never left Palestine *could not* have written the epistle; but we affirm that all evidence is clearly against that hypothesis, and in favour of an Alexandrian Jewish Christian. No Palestinian could be so ignorant as to say that the high priest went *daily* into the temple to offer sacrifice (vii. 27), or that he stood daily ministering (x. 11);[1] whereas Philo speaks of the high priest's *daily* ministrations.[2]

It is admitted that the typical mode of interpretation was not peculiar to Alexandrian Jews. Those of Palestine used it; not, however, to the same extent or in the same manner. If a distinction were made between typical interpretation and allegorising, the former is more applicable to the Palestinian Jews; the latter to Philo. Let it be allowed that Philo's allegories have to a great extent a different character from the typification of our epistle, though this assertion of Mynster's is questionable; the method of the latter, the point of view from which its author surveys the old Testament, and the extent to which he allegorises the Jewish economy, resemble Philo more than a Palestinian. It is unreasonable to look for an exact parallel between Philo's doctrine and that of our author, because the one was a Jew and the other a Christian. Mynster's statement too, approved though it be by Tholuck, that the spirit of Philo is as distant from the epistle's as heaven is from earth, is an exaggerated one.[3] Whatever limitations there be to the resemblance between the school of Philo and our author, no critic will deny that the likeness

[1] The various reading ἱερεύς in the latter passage obviates the objection as far as it is founded on x. 11.

[2] εὐχὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν.—*De speciall. legg.* vol. ii. p. 321, ed. Mangey.

[3] *Ueber den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs. Studien und Kritiken* for 1829, p. 336.

exists to an extent which Palestinian Judaism does not admit of. It is therefore unavailing on the part of Tholuck to quote Olshausen and Doepke for Palestinian exegesis, or Von Coelln and Mynster about Philo, in order to break the force of the similarity between the method of the Alexandrian Jews as exemplified by Philo and that of the Palestinians. Though the line of demarcation between Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism was not so sharply marked then as it afterwards was between the latter and Rabbinism, both were distinguished by individual features, indicating the presence or absence of a free breath proceeding from the Platonic philosophy. It is to be regretted that Frankel has thrown no light upon the subject in his two books on the Septuagint, though the title of one leads the reader to expect it.[1]

The question whether the writer used Philo's writings must be answered in the affirmative. Bleek has selected from Schulz and others twenty-two passages, which resemble parts of the epistle, in idea or expression, or in both; and it is not easy to resist the impression that the correspondence is more than accidental. A perusal of them makes it probable that the author of our epistle had read Philo. Like the Alexandrian writer, he attaches symbolical notions and religious reflections to Old Testament expressions, and weaves special explanations of single points into the course of the general argument, so that the constructive character of the epistle bears a great resemblance to Philo's writings. The constant habit of appending ideas to history, the alternation of reflections of different kinds, the perpetual returning from digressions into subordinate points to the general sequence of ideas, agrees with the manner of the Alexandrian Jew.

The same idea is expressed with regard to the same promise made to Abraham, in vi. 13 and Philo, viz.

[1] *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, 1841; *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, 1851.

that God did not swear by another but by Himself.[1] King of Salem is interpreted 'King of Peace,' as in vii. 1, etc.;[2] while the rare word rendered 'without mother' (vii. 3), is in Philo.[3]

The statement, 'Moses was faithful in all his house' (iii. 5), occurs in Philo,[4] in the very same words; and the term translated 'brightness' or 'effulgence'[5] is a frequent Philonian one. So also the Alexandrian writer often speaks of the word of God having a cutting and dividing power,[6] similarly to iv. 12.

The peculiar expression, 'high priest of our profession,' is Philonian;[7] and 'the Father of spirits' (xii. 9) refers to Philo's view of the soul's origin. The narrative respecting Moses refusing to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and preferring the reproaches attaching to his people to the splendour of a court (xi. 24–26), is like Philo.[8] Philonian passages, i.e. such as are conceived and expressed similarly to Philo, are: iv. 13; v. 8, 13, 14; vi. 13, etc.; vii. 7–26; ix. 7; x. 22, 23–29; xi. 1, 9–16, as may be seen in Carpzov's 'Sacred Exercitations' on the epistle. The quotation in xiii. 5 is Philonian;[9] xi. 4 and xiii. 2 agree with passages in his writing. Indeed, the 11th chapter is contained in Philo, often in the same words.[10]

Against Apollos the fact has been adduced that no trace of his authorship occurs in the early Alexandrian church. But if we cannot go further back than Pantænus, the tradition of the Apollos authorship may have disappeared between A.D. 66 and

[1] *Leg. Allegor.* vol. i. p. 127, ed. Mangey.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 102.
[3] *De Ebrietate*, vol. i. p. 368.
[4] *Leg. Allegor.* pp. 128, 132.
[5] ἀπαύγασμα.
[6] *Quis rerum divinarum hæres*, vol. i. pp. 491, 492, 504, 506.
[7] *De Somniis*, vol. i. p. 654. Mangey, however, thinks the reading corrupt.
[8] *De Vita Mosis*, vol. ii. p. 84.
[9] *De Confusione Linguarum*, vol. i. p. 430.
[10] Hilgenfeld's *Einleitung*, p. 384.

180. And the production may have been so eagerly welcomed by the Alexandrian Christians that an apostolic source was found for it, the name of the obscure author being dropped. Its high value in the eyes of the Alexandrians, owing to its allegorising character, may have led them to the well-known name of Paul. The Pauline advocates are exposed to a stronger objection. Why did the early Roman church uniformly reject the Pauline authorship ? If the apostle wrote it towards the end of his captivity, the Christians at Rome must have known it. And if it were addressed from some other place to the Jewish Christians there, is it likely that no trace of the tradition would have existed early in the second century ? How is it that the entire western Church disallowed Paul's authorship ?

It is also alleged against Apollos, that there is no trace of his name in connection with the epistle in ecclesiastical tradition. Clement, Barnabas, Luke are mentioned, not Apollos. This is a difficulty which cannot be solved for want of information. It may help, perhaps, to an explanation of it, that when the catholic Christians of the second century wished to form a list of the sacred books, and to get names for the anonymous ones, they would take those best known. Clement was a conspicuous man in the Roman church, the reputed author of an epistle ; Barnabas was Paul's companion and an apostle ; Luke was an evangelist and associate of Paul. Apollos's name was not so conspicuous as any of these ; nor was he intimately associated with Paul. He would therefore be passed over, while they were adopted by the early canon collectors.

### TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

It is probable that the epistle was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem, because temple-worship is supposed to exist at the time. 'Every high priest *is*

ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices. . . . . There are priests that *offer* gifts according to the law' (viii. 3, 4). 'The priests *go* always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God; but into the second the high priest goes alone once every year, not without blood' (ix. 6, 7). The whole passage (ix.6–10) speaks of something still existing. 'As the high priest *entereth* into the holy place every year,' etc. (ix. 25). 'For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood *is brought* into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, *are burned* without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth, therefore, unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach' (xiii. 11–13). 'That which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away' (viii. 13). These statements agree best with the opinion that Jewish worship had not been abolished at its *centre*. From xiii. 23, 24, it appears that Timothy was no longer Paul's companion; so that the notice of the apostle's imprisonment alludes to a period after his death, i.e. after A.D. 64. The Jewish insurrection against the Romans broke out in Judea and Alexandria A.D. 66; and there is no specific mention of it in the epistle. Yet the agitations and ferments that ushered in the Jewish war had begun, since signs of Christ's second coming were visible (x. 25); and the readers were exposed to trials which exercised their patience (xii. 4, 5; xiii. 13). In view of all the circumstances, we conclude that the letter was probably written A.D. 66. As to the place, the closing verses are inconsistent with the supposition that Paul wrote it at the end of his Roman captivity, for xiii. 19 does not imply that he was deprived of liberty and hoped to be speedily restored to it; nor do the words of xiii. 23 intimate that Timothy was his fellow-prisoner. On the contrary, the writer was not in Italy, as we see from xiii. 24. 'They of Italy salute you' is a phrase implying that the writer was not in

that country. Had he and the persons saluted been there, he would have said, 'they in Italy,' according to the analogy of 1 Peter v. 13. Perhaps Italian Christians, who had fled from their country on the breaking out of Nero's persecution and taken refuge in the locality of the author, are indicated by the expression. The place where it originated was probably Alexandria. The Sinaitic MS. with C. has only the subscription, 'to the Hebrews;' but A. adds 'from Rome,' and K. 'from Italy.'

### THE PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED.

A satisfactory conclusion respecting the readers for whom the work was originally designed cannot be reached. The title, 'to the Hebrews,' which did not proceed from the author, though it is found in the oldest MSS., as ℵ, A., B., K., does not contribute to the settlement of the question, because the New Testament use of 'Hebrew' is simply an Israelite by nation and religion, a descendant of Abraham; as Phil. iii. 5, and 2 Cor. xi. 22, attest. The attempt to restrict it to the Jews of Palestine, as distinguished from those dwelling in other countries, is more plausible than satisfactory. Our choice lies between two opinions, viz. that Jewish Christians in Palestine, especially at Jerusalem, were addressed; or Jewish Christians at Alexandria. The former has always been the prevailing view and is supported by various arguments, the strongest of which are these:—

1. The letter was written to Jewish Christians exclusively. No reference occurs to other converts, a fact pointing to Palestine, in which alone the church consisted of Jewish believers.

The fact that the congregations in Palestine were unmixed with Gentile converts is liable to doubt, as Acts x. 44, 45; xi. 1, etc.; xv. 7, etc., show. Besides, it is not correct that the readers are assumed to be

Jewish Christians exclusively, though they were not Gentile converts of a Judaising type, as Schürer argues.[1]

2. Chap. xiii. ver. 12, states that Jesus suffered 'without the gate,' which supposes the readers' familiarity with Jerusalem.

It was not necessary to live in Jerusalem to know that fact.

3. Those addressed had been exposed to reproach and persecution (x. 32–34), showing that the author was thinking of the early time of the Christian church at Jerusalem, and especially the persecutions preceding and following Stephen's martyrdom.

As the readers of the epistle must have been a second generation of Palestinian Christians and had not yet resisted unto blood, we cannot see with what propriety the writer could have alluded to persecutions which they did not themselves endure.

On the other hand, serious difficulties lie in the way of this view.

1. The epistle was written in Greek not Aramæan. The latter would have been more suitable to Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, being the medium of religious intercourse. The work is even composed in a more polished Greek, which would make it less appreciated by the mass of the church there. Besides, the author's knowledge of the Old Scriptures rests so exclusively upon the Septuagint, that he reasons on that basis where it departs entirely from the Hebrew, which he would hardly have ventured to do had he been writing to Palestinians.

2. The writer reproaches his readers with ignorance of Christianity, considering the time that had elapsed since they became acquainted with it. This is unsuitable to a church, from which all the teachers of Christianity originally proceeded; and is particularly out of place in the mouth of one who was not himself an

[1] *Studien und Kritiken* for 1876, p. 776.

immediate disciple of Christ (ii. 3). A church which had men like James at its head, from which Silas and Mark proceeded, could not have been so weak in faith or lukewarm, as to be in danger of falling back into Judaism, between A.D. 60 and 70.

3. The epistle speaks of a strong leaning, on the part of the readers, to the temple worship. They had a great desire to return to the Jewish hierarchy and the institutions connected with it. This is inapplicable to the Christian church at Jerusalem, in which, judging from Acts ii. 46 ; v. 42 ; xxi. 20–26, the native Jews adhered to the temple worship from the beginning. How could they be warned against apostasy from what they were attached to ? The 'strange doctrines' of xiii. 9 refer to Mosaic institutions ; how could the Jewish worship be strange to the Christians at Jerusalem, who were not afraid of reproaches because they maintained an old custom sanctioned by the example of the apostles themselves ? It is clear from Acts xxi. 20, that the fanatical Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, as well as those out of Palestine, insisted upon circumcision and the observance of the old customs.

4. The Christians in Judea were poor, and had received contributions from churches abroad. This does not harmonise with the contents of the epistle, which warn the readers against covetousness (xiii. 5), recommend liberality (xiii. 1, 2, 16), and praise them for beneficence (vi. 10). According to Wieseler, the last passage even affords a presumption of these very Christians having contributed to the collections made for the poor saints in Jerusalem. And he is right ; for *the saints* is a standing appellation of the Jerusalem Christians. Those who were called first by Christ and his apostles—the earliest recipients of the divine word—are so styled by way of eminence.

5. Considering the separation that took place between Paul and the Christians at Jerusalem, it is difficult to

understand how one standing in near relationship to Paul, and entertaining the same views as he did about the obligation of the law, could have been so closely allied to the church as xiii. 18, 19, implies, or sent to them greetings from the Italians, who were unknown to the Jerusalemite believers.

These arguments are decisive against the hypothesis that the epistle was written to the Jewish Christians in Palestine, especially those at Jerusalem ; and Langen [1] has done little to weaken them.

What then can be said in favour of Alexandria ? Much more than for Palestine. But it is not certain that readers in Egypt were addressed. Many considerations indeed seem to countenance that view ; yet they do not carry strong conviction to the mind. It is favourable to an Alexandrian circle of readers, that Greek was the language used in the synagogues there ; that the writer employs the Septuagint in its Alexandrian recension ; and that he even brings out of the Old Testament something not in it, but only in the Greek (xi. 21–28). The version had so great authority there, that the author could base his reasoning upon it notwithstanding incorrectnesses, and allegorise to readers accustomed to such interpretation. There is also a passage which is taken from the second book of the Maccabees (Hebrews xi. 35–37) ; a fact favouring Alexandria, for that book was written in Egypt. Indeed the best commentary on xi. 32–34 is the fate of the Jews at Alexandria under Caligula, described by Philo in his work against Flaccus—persecutions repeated in the year 40, according to the same author.[2] Such scenes must have affected the Jewish Christians there in some degree. '*They* had not yet resisted unto blood,' as the writer states.[3] The complexion of the

[1] *Theolog. Quartalschrift* for 1863.

[2] *De legatione ad Caium*, in vol. ii. of Mangey's ed.

[3] See Köstlin on the Epistle, in the *Tübingen Jahrbücher* for 1854, p. 395, *et seq.*

epistle would procure for it a ready acceptance among the Jewish Christians there. These considerations, however, apply to the personality of the writer as well as the locality of the readers.

The chief argument relied upon in favour of Alexandrian readers is the description of the temple in vii. 27 ; ix. 1–5 ; x. 11, which does not suit the structure in Jerusalem, but is said to agree with that in Leontopolis. Thus in vii. 27, the high priest is represented as *daily* offering up sacrifice—first, for his own sins, and then for the people's ; and in Philo the same official is said to offer prayers and sacrifices *every day*. But this writer does not assert that the high priest did so in the temple at Leontopolis, or in the most holy place of it. It is therefore impossible to show that the altar of incense stood in the holy of holies in the Egyptian temple, on which the priest offered daily. The deviations of the epistle to the Hebrews from the arrangements of the temple at Jerusalem cannot be identified with the usages of that at Leontopolis. If it could be shown that the altar of incense stood there in the most holy place, and that the high priest presented a *sin offering* on it daily, the matter would be clearer ; but Philo does not help us to this. That the temple of Onias, though built after the model of that in Jerusalem, differed from it in various respects, may be inferred from the Talmud and Josephus ; but that the divergence of the copy from the original explains why the holy of holies, which was empty at Jerusalem, is said to have contained the ark, with the pot of manna, Aaron's rod, and the tables of stone—the pot of manna and the rod being *in* the ark, not *before* it, and the altar of incense also being *in* the most holy place, not *before* it (ix. 4, 5)—cannot be sustained. All that can be said in explanation is, that the writer, instead of having solely in his mind the sin offering of the high priest on the great day of atonement, mixed up with it the daily sacrifices of the Levitical

priests, which might be done the more readily because the Mishna states that the high priest could do it as often as he pleased; and Josephus, that he joined the ordinary priests in their work of sacrifice, on many occasions. Wieseler's arguments connecting vii. 27; ix. 1–5; x. 11, with the temple in Egypt, fail to carry conviction. The author's reasoning is not founded on the temple of Jerusalem, or that of Onias in Egypt, but on the original Mosaic institutions, which he holds to be imperfect shadows of things to come. He takes *the tabernacle*, which suited his purpose better than the temple, because it was an easier instrument for carrying out his allegorising details respecting the relation between the high priests of the Old and New Testaments. 'Christ entered through the greater and more perfect *tabernacle* into the holy place.'[1] What recommends the view of the readers being Alexandrian as well as the author, is the improbability of Apollos addressing such an epistle to Jewish Christians elsewhere. How could they appreciate or understand his reasoning? Could they follow his spiritualising of Judaism, or his spiritual coincidences of its organic arrangements with Christianity? Even in Alexandria, the majority could scarcely apprehend the argument of the epistle, much less the Jewish believers elsewhere. The circumstances of the readers must therefore be considered as well as the writer, as also the contact between them implied in his conceptions of Christianity.

The epistle of Barnabas, which is an Alexandrian production belonging to the second decade of the second century, confirms the view now given of the epistle to the Hebrews. Like the latter, it presents Paulinism in a developed state, and proceeds a step further in the path opened up by our letter. It takes the spiritual sense resulting from the law of typical interpretation as the abiding truth of the Old

[1] Köstlin, in the *Tübingen Jahrb.* for 1854, p. 423, etc.

Testament, so that the gnosis of Christianity emerges through the letter of the law into a *new* law; and Christianity itself, having abolished the literal acceptation of the law, becomes 'the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, having no yoke of necessity.' The path opened up by the epistle to the Hebrews is followed out in Barnabas.

If the view of those who deny the epistolary character of the work were correct, it would be unnecessary to look for a definite circle of readers. But the title of *epistle* which was accorded to the production at an early period need not be discarded, for it is not without countenance in the letter itself. Reuss's description of the epistle as 'a rhetorical essay upon the superiority of Christianity to Judaism with an epistolary appendix having no connection with the preceding part,' is a needless refinement. The first epistle of John has no epistolary introduction, and is not less a letter on that account. There are also passages concerning the individual and concrete relations of a church (ii. 3; v. 11, 12; vi. 10; x. 25, 32–36; xii. 4). The writer sustained a well-known relation to his readers, whose state and circumstances he describes, blaming them severely for their want of progress, and exhorting to steadfastness. If it was not addressed to a single church, the epistle is unintelligible. Hence it cannot be considered a circular treatise intended for all Jewish Christians; but only for those of a certain place, as the last chapter, where they are requested to pray for the writer that he may be restored to them, and to obey their teachers, shows. They are also informed that Timothy is released, from whom they might expect a visit along with the author. Salutations are sent to their presiding elders. These facts imply mutual acquaintance. Although, therefore, the former part of the epistle is like a general dissertation intended for readers confined to

no particular district or country, the conclusion restricts its scope, and justifies in a measure the common title of a *letter* (xiii. 22). That it was addressed to the Jewish believers at Rome, as Holtzmann and Zahn try to show, is improbable.[1] The reasoning of the latter in favour of Roman Christians as the persons addressed must be rejected, since it is inconsistent with various parts of the epistle itself. That Jewish believers predominated in the church of the metropolis at the time, and were in danger of relapsing into their old religion, is unlikely. How could it also be said that they had not yet resisted unto blood, when the Neronian persecution was past? Nor does the Alexandrian complexion of the epistle suit the character of the Roman believers. Even if the author were himself a Christian of that type, he must have adapted his address to the modes of thought peculiar to the readers. Neither Roman nor Italian Christians fulfil the requirements of the case; and Wetstein's view, though supported by Zahn, must be abandoned.[2] The apostle Paul had taught at Rome not long before, fixing his conceptions of Christianity in the Christian church. Is it likely that Apollos would soon address the Jewish Christians of the place so differently? If it be said that the Philonian nature of the work is due to the writer, not the readers, we ask, Would not Apollos, or any Pauline Christian, have given his instructions a form better adapted to the intelligence of his readers? And is it probable, that after Paul's death and the Neronian persecution, a large church, consisting of Jewish Christians mainly, existed at Rome? Were the influences of that capital likely to tempt them back to the old religion? Did Judaism flourish there after the martyrdom of Paul and the Neronian persecution? On the contrary, Christianity

[1] See Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, vol. viii. p. 532; *Studien und Kritiken* for 1859, p. 297, etc.; Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, x. 1, etc.

[2] See Herzog's *Encyklopädie*, vol. v. p. 666, etc.

increased and prevailed ; the ancient religion proportionally declining in the esteem of the cultivated. Jewish Christianity kept its ground long after ; but Judaism had little attraction for those who thought they had its essentials in the type of Christianity which took Peter for its representative.

### LANGUAGE.

The epistle was written in Greek. The opinion that it was written in Hebrew is untenable, though advocated by Michaelis and revived by Biesenthal. In favour of its being composed in Greek, we may refer to the style, which has the freedom and ease of an original, to the exclusive use of the Septuagint even in its mistakes, as at i. 6, and ii. 7, where the rendering of the Hebrew *Elohim* (gods) by *angels* is taken from the Greek, though the Hebrew word does not bear that sense ; to the paronomasias, which though possible in the case of a version, are improbable (v. 8 ; x. 38, 39 ; xi. 37 ; xiii. 14) ; and especially to the double meaning of διαθήκη (*covenant* and *testament*) in ix. 16, 17, which the corresponding Hebrew word does not permit ; to the interpretation of the Hebrew terms *Melchizedek* and *Salem* (vii. 2) by corresponding Greek words ; and to the fact, that Greek terms appear which could only have been expressed in Hebrew or Aramæan by a circumlocution.[1] The sole argument of any weight on the opposite side is derived from the parties supposed to be addressed, Jewish Christians in Palestine, whose vernacular dialect was not Greek but Aramæan—an argument which has no force against such as believe that the letter was addressed to the Jewish Christians at Alexandria. But even the Jewish Christians of Judea must have understood Greek between A.D. 60 and 70. That tongue rapidly acquired currency among

[1] Compare i. 1, 3 ; xii. 1, 2 ; and in ii. 5, 8, the verb ὑποτάσσω.

all classes in Palestine, and encroached on the dialect of the Hebrews as the destruction of Jerusalem approached.

### OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The immediate cause of the letter was the state of the Alexandrian Jews who had embraced Christianity and were in danger of apostatising. In consequence of the hazard they were in, the author addressed them, that they might be established in the faith. The relative claims of Judaism and Christianity had often engaged the attention of Paul. The writer shows the superiority of the one religion to the other in a conciliatory tone. He does not attack the Jewish economy, but states its use and purport. According to him, it was typical. Why then should his readers go back to that which the new religion presented in a better form? The Jewish Christians of Alexandria or at least the cultivated part of them, were more liable to return to Judaism because it had become philosophical and rationalistic in the hands of Philo. Letter had given place to spirit; and allegory had explained away the objectionable parts of the Old Testament. The need of Christianity seemed less to those who had been born Jews, when they learned the hidden senses which their leading thinkers attached to institutions and ceremonies outwardly uninviting. In order to prevent their return to the old, the author of the epistle sets forth the new under the aspect of a priesthood, a spiritual priesthood, with a great high priest unchanging and eternal, ever living to intercede, and ever prevailing with his Father in heaven for the good of his people. Atoning power is centred in him who offered himself once for all, and entered into the true holy of holies as the author and finisher of faith. The old economy is in the new. It would therefore be folly in persons who had tasted the heavenly gift to fall back into a system which is defec-

tive and transient. If the law completed nothing, and if Christianity introduced a better hope founded on a new priesthood, why renounce the satisfactory for the weak ?

CONTENTS.

The epistle has been variously divided, some separating it into three leading parts, others into two. The latter is preferable, i.e. i. 1–x. 18 ; and x. 19–xiii. 25. The first portion is doctrinal, the second hortatory. Bleek objects to the twofold division as unsuitable, because the nature of the entire epistle is admonitory ; observing that the didactic statements of the one part are intersected by admonitions, and that the doctrinal and hortatory in the other are not separated. Yet the didactic element preponderates in i. 1–x. 18 ; the practical in x. 19–xiii. Without therefore meaning to intimate that the author himself had the division in his mind, the separation at x. 19 is the most convenient. From xiii. 18 to the end is a sort of appendix.

1. To show the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, the writer begins with comparing Christ, the founder of the new economy, to the mediators of the old. As angels took part in the law's promulgation, and Moses was mediator between God and the Israelites, Christ is shown to be more exalted than both. He is the Son of God, the Creator of heaven and earth ; whereas angels worship him, and instead of being like him at the head of the kingdom, they are only ministering spirits to the redeemed, employed in executing the commands of a superior. To apply this argument, an admonition is subjoined respecting the greater attention due to the salvation announced by Christ. If neglect of the law given by the mediation of angels could not be tolerated with impunity, much less can disregard of the gospel. In prosecuting the proof of

Christ's superiority to angels, he states that the future world or Christianity is not subjected to them but to the Son, as is proved by Psalm viii. But in asserting Christ's dominion, he feels that an objection might arise. We do not see yet all things put under him; to obviate which he shows why Christ must take a lower station than the angels, and suffer death in it. His humiliation unto death was necessary, in fulfilment of the divine design to provide an atonement for sin, as he did not come to rescue and redeem angels but men (i. ii.).

The author now compares Christ with Moses the executive head of the old dispensation, and his statement takes the form of exhortation. Look to Christ, he says, who is faithful to God as Moses was, and yet far exalted above him. *He* was counted worthy of greater honour than Moses, as the founder of a community is greater than the community itself. Moses himself was a servant to the founder; Christ was the Son. To this is annexed a warning against unbelief, drawn from the Israelites in the wilderness. Quoting Psalm xcv., he expatiates on the meaning of the passage, showing that the promised rest into which the Israelites could not enter because of unbelief, included a spiritual rest still future. We should therefore strive to enter into that rest; for the word of God, especially its commination, has a living power to seize on and judge the spirit (iii. 1–iv. 13).

Having instituted a comparison between Christ and Moses, and gone off into a warning digression, he considers the former as a high priest, as proposed at the commencement of the 3rd chapter. The proof that he is a high priest begins with a parallel. A human priest appointed for the service of men, partakes of the weaknesses of humanity, and is able to sympathise with erring men by entering into their feelings. As the earthly high priest is appointed by God, so is

Christ. His office is not usurped any more than theirs. But the parallel is postponed, the writer introducing the old priestly king Melchizedek, instead of the Levitical high priest. Before he proceeds, however, to compare Christ and Melchizedek, he inserts a hortatory passage, complaining of his readers' slow understanding, and affirming that they needed instruction in first principles rather than the difficult truths alluded to. But he waives the discussion of elementary doctrine, and advances to the higher truths, justifying that course by the fact that it is impossible to restore the fallen. He thus warns them against apostatising to Judaism, moderating his tone in the end by expressing a wish that they would attain to the full assurance of hope. And to encourage them in this, the example of Abraham is adduced, to whom, as well as to all believers, the promise was confirmed by an oath (iv. 14–vi. 20).

Returning to the point he had left, viz. the representation of Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, he shows its superiority to the Levitical. It is perpetual and above the Levitical, because Abraham himself paid tithes to Melchizedek, the less being blessed by the greater. In Abraham all his descendants may be considered as acknowledging Melchizedek's superiority. And if the priesthood be changed, the law too must be changed. The difference of the Christian priesthood is exhibited in descent, and in the power of an endless office, as is testified in Psalm cx. The Mosaic law, which was abrogated, is contrasted with that introduced in its stead. The one was weak and unprofitable, the other introduced a better hope. The Levitical priests were made without an oath; the new priesthood was appointed by an oath. The Levitical line was mortal; Christ lives for ever. The Aaronic priests were sinful and must offer sacrifices both for themselves and the people; Christ is unspotted, and

offered himself a sacrifice once for all. Christ is a high priest of the heavenly sanctuary, whose service is superior in proportion as the covenant he established is better. God himself did not regard the first dispensation as permanent or complete, but promised a better one, as is proved by the Old Testament (vii. 1–viii. 13).

The author reverts to the comparison of the ministrations performed by the high priests under the old covenant and the head of the new, describing the sanctuary with its apartments and furniture, the service of the priests, its symbolical use and unsatisfying nature. But Christ, the high priest of the new covenant, entered once for all into the heavenly sanctuary by means of his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. If the blood and ashes of beasts had a purifying power, much more has the blood of Christ. If they conferred ceremonial purification, this purifies the conscience. Christ by his death became the founder of a new covenant, and abolished the guilt of sin for ever by the one sacrifice of himself. It was necessary that he should die, for every covenant is ratified by the death of a victim; and accordingly the Mosaic covenant itself was confirmed by the shedding of blood. On the other hand, the sacrifice of the heavenly high priest is a superior ratification, because he appeared once to destroy sin, and will not appear again till he comes without sin. In continuation of the leading idea that Christ took away sin by the sacrifice of himself, the writer affirms that the sacrifices of the law, repeated yearly, could not give perfect peace of conscience, else they would not have been repeated; and proves by Psalm xl., that whereas God takes no pleasure in sacrifice, He wills that we should be sanctified by the offering of Christ's body. Such sanctification agrees with a promise made respecting the new covenant in the book of Jeremiah, that no more sacrifices should be required (ix. 1–x. 18).

2. This portion consists of a great variety of admonitions.

The author exhorts his readers to appropriate the benefits of Christ's priesthood, and to beware of apostasy, since heavy judgments would overtake such as by falling away despised the grace of God. He encourages them to return to their first love, by reminding them of their steadfastness after their conversion, which they should continue to exhibit. The characteristics of faith are briefly stated, with a long series of Old Testament saints exemplifying its power. It is a strong confidence in things hoped for, a conviction of things unseen. The examples of it are taken from the antediluvian period, from the patriarchal age till Moses, from the exodus till the occupation of Canaan, and from that time till the Maccabees. All these, however, did not realise the promised Messiah, while God provided something better for us, that they should not reach completeness without us. The last examples lead the writer to enjoin steadfastness, while he refers his readers to them as well as to Christ himself. Chastisement is a salutary discipline, appointed by God for his children's good. He counsels peace with all; dissuades from remissness, impurity, and sinful inclination to forsake God. To the solemn warning against apostasy is prefixed a comparison of the way in which God showed Himself to the Israelites at the giving of the law, with the communion of the new covenant into which Christians have entered. Let believers therefore be thankful for the kingdom they have, serving God with reverence and fear (x. 19–xii. 29).

A number of general exhortations follow. Individual virtues are recommended, as brotherly love, hospitality, compassion, chastity, contentment with present things apart from covetousness. The readers should be steadfast in the Christian faith and worship, after the example of their departed teachers, avoiding

Judaism, which is inconsistent with a share in Christ's redemption. After enjoining subjection to their pastors, the writer concludes with personal notices; requests an interest in the prayers of his readers, hoping that he might be restored to them the sooner, and closes with a benediction (xiii.).

The value of this epistle has been variously estimated. Extreme views, like that of Dr. John Owen, who asserts that 'the world may as well want the sun as the Church this epistle,' are not worth mentioning. The work has influenced the subsequent current of Christian thought. Its doctrine of the divine Logos and Christ's high-priesthood were accepted and confirmed by later writers, as by Clement of Rome,[1] Polycarp of Smyrna, and the author of the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs. By applying Philo's idea of the Logos to the person of Christ, his divinity was brought out much more than it is in Paul's epistles. Thus the union of Paulinism with the religious philosophy of Alexandria has been far-reaching in its effects. Yet Pauline reflectiveness, though less objective than that of the epistle, is of higher value. The arguments are often weak, mere *argumenta ad hominem*, presupposing a Jewish taste for allegory. The circle of ideas in which the writer moves is too Judaic to commend itself to the acceptance of Christian readers. Thus when it is said that Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek in Abraham, because he was 'in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him;' that the rest promised to the Jews of old did not refer either to the rest which God is said to have taken on the seventh day of creation or to the possession of Canaan, but to a spiritual rest in heaven; that Psalm cii. 25–27 alludes to Christ, there styled Jehovah; that the patriarchs were led on by the desire of *the heavenly* Jerusalem; that the vail separating the two apartments of the temple typified the flesh of Christ; that

[1] Comp. chapters xxxvi., lviii.

the heavenly sanctuary must be purified with better things than animal sacrifices,—these and many other statements are peculiar to the writer. The view given of the old economy and its arrangements, as if they were foreshadows of Christianity, is a later one. In like manner, the continued efficacy of Christ's priesthood in heaven is an un-Pauline sentiment. The epistle has too much of the Alexandrian element to be of the high theological importance which belongs to the larger productions of Paul. A mixture of spiritualising Judaism with distinctive Paulinism gives it a peculiar tendency which is sometimes deteriorating, though sometimes the reverse. The best portions are the practical and hortatory, i.e. from x. 19 to the end, where a pure and lofty spirit expresses itself in encouraging precepts. Promises cheer the mind of the believer; hopes of a glorious reward encourage him. He may come boldly to the throne of grace and suffer joyfully, because his great high priest is in heaven, having been made perfect through sufferings. There is no continuing city here; the Christian seeks one to come. Many such declarations make the epistle most acceptable to the devout mind. Theoretical believers will not find it equally serviceable, though it may stimulate them to run the Christian race with zeal.

# THE REVELATION.

## AUTHORSHIP.

THE title 'Apocalypse of John *the divine*' is not in any old MS. The epithet was not given to the apostle till the Arian controversy in the fourth century; when his authority was emphasised in opposition to the Arians who rejected the book. No title proceeded from the author himself. The uncial MSS. ℵ and C. have merely 'Apocalypse of John;' which is also in the subscription of A.

The prevailing opinion has been that John the apostle, the son of Zebedee, wrote the book of Revelation. In favour of this view internal and external arguments are advanced, of which the following is a summary.

1. External.

Hengstenberg begins with Polycarp the apostle's disciple, who writes in the epistle to the Philippians: 'Let us therefore so serve him with fear and all reverence, as he himself hath commanded, and as the apostles who have preached the gospel unto us, and *the prophets who have foretold the coming of our Lord*, being zealous of what is good,' etc.[1] According to Hengstenberg, the prophets are not personally different from the apostles; John

[1] *οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης εὐλαβείας, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο, καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμῖν ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται, οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· ζηλωταὶ περὶ τὸ καλόν, κ.τ.λ.*—Chapter 6.

in the Apocalypse being their representative.[1] But the Old Testament prophets are meant.

The most ancient testimony for the authenticity of the Apocalypse comes indirectly. Two Cappadocian bishops, probably belonging to the fifth century, Andrew and Arethas, relate that Papias looked upon the book as *inspired* and *credible*,[2] which was at that time tantamount to a belief of its apostolic origin. It is true that Papias does not speak of it as the work of John the apostle in express terms ; but his regarding it as of *divine authority* and *credible* comports best with the idea of its being written by none other. It has seemed singular that Eusebius omits the testimony of this early writer. But his silence is capable of an easy explanation. The historian disliked Papias because of the millennarian views he held. The extravagant expectations of John the presbyter's hearer and his day were probably derived from oral tradition, in the opinion of Eusebius ; or if they were not, Dionysius of Alexandria had influenced the historian, leading him to doubt the authenticity of the book. One thing is clear, that Eusebius would not have omitted Papias's testimony about the author of the Revelation, had the latter expressed hesitation respecting it, which he probably did not ; for he belonged to a country where he had good opportunities of knowing the origin of the book as well as the presbyter John to whom Dionysius ascribes it.

The testimony of Melito agrees with Papias's. Eusebius says that he wrote a book 'about the devil and the Apocalypse of John.'[3] The fact that the bishop of Sardis, one of the cities to which an epistle is addressed in the introductory part of the Revelation, wrote on the book, goes far to prove its apostolicity.

Justin Martyr is the earliest writer who expressly

[1] *Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes*, vol. ii. 2, p. 98.

[2] θεόπνευστος and ἀξιόπιστος. [3] *H. E.* iv. 26.

attributes the work to John the apostle at Ephesus.[1] Rettig tries to impugn the authenticity of the passage in Justin without effect. Eusebius states that Justin wrote his Dialogue or Disputation with Trypho, in which the passage about the Apocalypse occurs, at Ephesus, the first of the seven cities to which the author addressed an epistle (Rev. i. 11 ; ii. 1). In the circle within which he lived and acted, Justin knew of none other than the apostle as author. We conclude, therefore, that the opinion about John the presbyter's authorship had not originated before the middle of the second century. There is no reason for thinking that Justin rested on exegetical grounds rather than historical tradition. The earliest Christian period relied on persons more than writings for the support of their faith.

Not long after Justin, Apollonius, a presbyter at Ephesus, drew proofs from the Apocalypse against the Montanists, as Eusebius states.[2] The context of the passage in which the historian speaks of him leaves no room for doubt that Apollonius used the book as the apostle's.

Irenæus is also a witness for the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, appealing to ancient MSS. for the genuineness of the number 666, as well as to persons who had seen the apostle John.[3] This testimony has great weight, because Irenæus must have learnt the truth about the writer in proconsular Asia before he went to Gaul. The seven churches would carefully preserve a document addressed to them. We do not see that the witness of Irenæus is weakened by the fact that he was mistaken in dating the book at the end of Domitian's reign ; or because he accepted superstitious and absurd accounts of John from the presbyters who professed to have seen him. He probably derived the late date he assigns to the Apocalypse from a false in-

[1] *Dialog.* c. 81, p. 294, ed. 3 Otto.
[2] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18.
[3] *Advers. Hæres.* v. 30.

terpretation of itself or from vague report. And as to the superstitious opinions of John received from the elders, they have nothing to do with the composition of a work like the present.

The epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne given by Eusebius,[1] also presupposes the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, so that from Asia Minor to Gaul the book is well attested as John's in the second century. Tertullian uses it as apostolic,[2] showing that Africa participated in the historical tradition that prevailed in other countries. The Muratorian list ascribes the work to John.

The want of one witness at the beginning of the third century is suspicious at first sight, viz. the Syriac translation from which the Apocalypse is absent. Nor did this old version admit the book afterwards, though scholars in the Syriac church subsequently put it on a level with the rest of the New Testament. A later Syriac translation of the Apocalypse appeared, which was never thought to be equal in authority to the Peshito. It is true that Hug and others suppose the Peshito to have had the book at first; but this is certainly incorrect. How then is its exclusion from this ancient version to be accounted for? When the Peshito was made, perhaps the Apocalypse had not found its way to Edessa, the birth-place of the version.

It is certain that Theophilus of Antioch, at the end of the second century, accepted the book as apostolic.[3] In the same century the Alogi ascribed it to Cerinthus; and Caius of Rome, from opposition to Montanism, ventured to make the same statement, as a fragment of Proclus's preserved by Eusebius asserts: 'But Cerinthus, by means of revelations which he pretended to have been written by a great apostle, falsely introduces wonderful things to us, as if they were shown him by

[1] *H. E.* v. 1. [2] *Contra Marcion.* iii. 14. [3] Euseb. iv. 24.

angels,' etc.[1] This passage has given rise to discussion, some affirming that the revelations spoken of do not mean the present Apocalypse but *forged revelations* as a counterpart to it. We agree with Lücke in referring it to the former.

Marcion and his followers excluded the book from their canon, and therefore rejected its apostolic authorship. This arose from their peculiar tenets.

When we pass to the third century, the evidence for the apostolicity of the book is most favourable. Clement of Alexandria[2] ascribed it to John; as did Origen[3] notwithstanding his opposition to millennarianism. Cyprian, Lactantius, and Methodius were of the same opinion. Hippolytus probably wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, directed against the Montanists. This is inferred from a statement of Ebedjesu respecting him: 'St. Hippolytus, martyr and bishop, composed a work concerning the dispensation . . . . and an apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John the apostle and evangelist.'[4]

Critical doubts began with Dionysius of Alexandria, owing, as it would seem, to doctrinal disputes with the millennarian adherents of Nepos. This father ascribes the work to John the presbyter not the apostle. He bases his opinion on internal grounds, on style, language, and characteristic peculiarities, arguing from the differences of the fourth gospel and first epistle general of John, that the same person could not have written the Apocalypse also.[5] His reasoning is valid on the assumption that the gospel and first epistle proceeded from the apostle, but it has no worth as an independent

[1] ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος, ὁ δι' ἀποκαλυψέων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει, κ.τ.λ.—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28.

[2] *Stromata*, lib. vi. p. 667; and ii. p. 207.

[3] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25; and *Comment. in Joann. Opp.* vol. iv. p. 17.

[4] Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. iii. part i. p. 15.

[5] *H. E.* vii. 24, 25.

testimony, because it contradicts ecclesiastical tradition. When Dionysius appeals to *some* of his predecessors who rejected the book and thought it should be excluded from the canon, he could only have alluded to the few who looked upon it as the work of Cerinthus ; to Caius, the Alogi, and the antimontanists generally.

In the fourth century Eusebius[1] seems undecided about retaining or rejecting the Apocalypse. His opposition to millennarianism, not less than the critical doubts of Dionysius, inclined him to the latter course. On the other hand, a constant and firm tradition was arrayed on behalf of apostolicity. The historian conjectures with Dionysius, that the writer may be John the presbyter ; but affirms that he will not refuse to put it among the *acknowledged* books, if cause for doing so should appear.[2] This wavering policy tells against his honesty as a historian ; since he might have cited older witnesses for the apostolic origin of the book had he been disposed.

It is scarcely necessary to follow the series of external testimonies further than Eusebius. Later witnesses belong to the history of the canon. Enough has been given to show that the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse is as well attested as that of any book in the New Testament. How can it be proved that Paul wrote the epistle to the Galatians for example, on the basis of external evidence, if it be denied that the apostle John wrote the closing book of the canon ? With the limited stock of early ecclesiastical literature that survives the wreck of time, we should despair of proving the authenticity of any New Testament book, if that of the Apocalypse be rejected.

Let it not be urged that the patristic tradition is not unanimous, and that little weight attaches to the testimonies of the fathers because they are often discordant. The historical tradition relative to the Apocalypse seems

[1] *H. E.* iii. 25. [2] εἴγε φανείη.

to have been interrupted only by doctrinal views. Had not Montanism and millennarianism appeared, we should have heard of no voice raised against John's authorship. We do not deny that the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries adopted vague traditions without inquiring whether they rested on a good foundation ; and that they were generally incapable of, if not disinclined to, critical investigation ; or that they followed their immediate predecessors, contented to glide down the ecclesiastical stream without examining the ground of their belief. There were noble exceptions ; and it is an undoubted fact, that from the middle of the second century, several distinguished fathers connected with the church in Asia Minor, who had excellent opportunities of knowing the prevailing tradition there, received the work as an authentic document of John's. Clement and Origen too, whose views did not agree with the book, received it as apostolic. The basis of the tradition cannot be explained away without violating historical evidence.

2. Internal evidence.

Does internal evidence coincide with the external as regards authorship ? In four places John calls himself the author (i. 1, 4, 9 : xxii. 8) ; sometimes without a predicate ; at other times, *servant of Jesus Christ* ; or, *your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ*, in relation to his readers ; while in xxii. 9 he is styled by the angel a *brother of the prophets*. He presents himself in the character of a man well known to the Christian churches of proconsular Asia—an influential personage, of whose divine mission they could have no doubt. The predicates attributed to him show a consciousness of dignity, yet a modesty withal, arising from a sense of the union subsisting among true Christians. Though he does not call himself *an apostle*, he is commanded to write what he had seen and *to send* it to the seven

churches (i. 11). He is *the prophet* not *apostle* of the Messiah, in this instance. There was no apparent necessity for the writer to style himself *an apostle*; the epithets accompanying the name sufficed to indicate his person. He was the direct witness of the Messiah, the announcer of the revelations of God, the prophet of the new covenant. He speaks of himself like Daniel, *I John*. He treats of the apostolic age, when Jewish ideas prevailed and the expectation of Messiah was fresh in the general mind. At the time he wrote, several apostles were living; but none other could lay claim to the position and privileges which he asserts. A book bearing his name, and composed thirty years before his death, would have called forth a contradiction, because he knew that it would be taken for his; and such contradiction would have reached us from the circle of his disciples, through Irenæus. Later assertions of its non-apostolic authorship arose from doctrinal interests, not from historic tradition.

Do the contents agree with the assumption that the book proceeds from an apostolic man; or do they present phenomena inconsistent with John's known character and the time when he wrote? To answer this question, we must take a general survey of the contents; and they are certainly apostolic, chiefly the eschatology (doctrine of the last things) which is a prominent feature of the book. The idea of their Lord's speedy coming had made a deep impression upon the minds of the apostles. Like the Messiah in Daniel, he was to appear in the clouds of heaven with great power and glory. The near approach of this event was the animating and consolatory motive held forth in the apostolic epistles. It was present to the mind of Paul who proclaims Maran atha; speaks of the Lord's coming with all his saints; of his descending from heaven with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God; who believes that *the day of the Lord*—equiva-

lent to *the day of Jesus Christ, that day, the day of redemption*—is at hand; and that he should live to see it. The saints should then be judges of the world, and even of angels. Now Paul assures us that he received nothing from the other apostles, but that his ideas came from immediate revelation; which shows that the eschatological element in Matthew's gospel and the Apocalypse was an essential part of primitive Christianity. Nor is it confined to Paul's epistles. It appears in the letter to the Hebrews; Peter's epistles teach the same thing. The epistles of John express it also. James recommends patience till the coming of the Lord, which he declares to be near. And Jude proves from the existence of mockers, that it is the last time. The description of Christ's advent thus expected by the New Testament writers is developed in the 24th chapter of the first gospel; where the sentiment of retribution appears in the form of a solemn judicial process preceded by great distress; and the Messiah reveals himself in splendour, ushering in a new dispensation in which the faithful should be recompensed for their sufferings. These ideas are present in the Apocalypse, the main difference between it and other apostolic writings relating to the expected advent consisting in the wide interval which John puts between the manifestation of Messiah and the end of the world—the space of a thousand years; while they place the time of the Messianic kingdom close to the process of judgment.

In like manner the *christology* of the Apocalypse contains apostolic elements. The idea of Jesus the Messiah is, that he existed before the world; that he is the highest spirit; that by virtue of his Messianic nature he was like Jehovah from the beginning; that he is the Alpha and Omega though created; and that he is an angel who received his Messiah-nature from the Father. Hence he is termed 'the beginning of the creation of God' (iii. 14); and the expression 'Son of God' (ii. 18) refers to the

divine sovereignty bestowed upon him by the Father. The spiritual and potential perfections he possesses were bestowed upon him as a reward for his faithful and victorious career. He is the organ of communication between God and his people; the 'Word of God,' not 'God the Word' as in John i. 1. The name, 'Word of God,' has not a metaphysical sense as if it expressed the principle constituting the person of Christ; nor does it imply an independent hypostasis proceeding from the substance of the Father like the *Word* of the fourth gospel, but rather a being possessing divine power and prerogatives received from the Father. The name is a preparatory step to the proper Logos-doctrine, to which the peculiarities of the Alexandrian Logos, pre-existence and creative agency, could be easily attached. When he has accomplished the purposes for which the government of the world was given into his hands, he resigns the power and kingdom to the Father and reigns under Him (xi. 15–17). This agrees to some extent with the Pauline christology, in which Christ is set forth as a typical man, one in whom *pneuma* was the essential principle, who existed before he was manifested to mankind, a being representing ideal humanity.

The conception of *antichrist* also harmonises with apostolic times. The name of this power does not appear in the book, but the idea is found in a concrete form. The antichrist of the Revelation is a worldly prince, in whom the powers of evil are concentrated. Bearing the symbolical name of the beast, he is spoken of as a definite historical person; and other hostile beast-forms are latent in him. He is the representative of heathen opposition to the kingdom of Messiah. In the second epistle to the Thessalonians the idea of antichrist appears in one of its early stages as *the man of sin* and *the son of perdition*; but the person or thing referred to is obscure. The Revelation presents the same idea when it implies a heathen impersonation of hostility to Chris-

tianity. One of the redactors of the canonical Matthew speaks of *many* antichrists; for he has a warning against *false Christs* or Messianic pretenders arising out of Judaism (chapter xxiv.). Thus plurality is attached to the idea. The name *antichrist* occurs first in John's epistle, where a plurality of persons so called spring from the bosom of the Christian Church. When the proper humanity of Christ was denied, the hostile element was found in the many antichrists of Gnosticism. The later New Testament writings find antichrist in false doctrine, neither in heathenism nor Judaism, nor in a single person representing them. False teachers or heretics are the antichrists of the Johannine epistles.

Need we add, that the *pneumatology* of the Revelation agrees with that of the apostolic writings, and contains no later ideas than the Pauline? The power of the devil in relation to the kingdom of Christ is presented under the same aspect in the Apocalypse and Paul's epistles. Though the arch enemy of man was vanquished by Christ at his first advent, he was not subdued for ever; the contest with him continues till the second advent. This prince of darkness has legions of spirits associated with himself; and his conqueror the Messiah must therefore be *King of kings* and *Lord of lords*; or, as it is expressed in the Colossian epistle, *the head of all principality and power.*

As far as the individuality of John is reflected in the New Testament and tradition, it is in harmony with the contents of the Apocalypse. The sons of Zebedee were impetuous spirits, whose feelings led them easily into excess or revenge. They wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the inhabitants of a Samaritan village, and begged the chief places in the kingdom of heaven. John forbad one who presumed to cast out devils in the name of Jesus. He was a Boanerges or son of thunder, with a decided individuality, and an ardent disposition requiring checks. As far as he

appears in the Acts and Pauline epistles, his mind is somewhat narrow, unemancipated from national prejudices. The Quartodecimans appealed to his Jewish practice about the passover; while Polycrates of Ephesus states that he was a priest and wore the sacerdotal plate.[1] This agrees with priestly particulars in the seven epistles; and if he were of a priestly family, which is not improbable, he might appropriate the sacerdotal insignia, representing himself as one initiated into the mysteries of Jesus. Asiatic tradition considered him as a mediator between Christ and the Church. He had the surname of *the virgin* (compare xiv. 4), and appeared as an ascetic who received divine communications. We cannot tell what subject chiefly occupied his mind while he continued in Jerusalem. Perhaps he was tracing out the signs of the returning Messiah and looking for the great future at hand. But the dissolution of the bond existing between the Jews and Jewish Christians must have caused him to feel that the place was no longer a fit abode. He could have no further communion with the enemies of Christ, as the unbelieving Jews were considered. The very metropolis they prided in, with all its ancestral renown, was to be overthrown; and a *new kingdom of Israel* brought down to earth. It was therefore time to depart.

After removing to Asia Minor, he is described as indignantly contending against false teachers both Jewish and Gentile. Irenæus states from Polycarp, that the apostle, going into a bath on one occasion, discovered Cerinthus there, and, leaping out of it, hasted away, saying he was afraid of the building falling upon him and crushing him with the heretic. These traits are faithfully reflected in the book before us, which betrays an impassioned spirit full of rage against the despisers of God and his anointed, with images of

[1] ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς.—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31.

dragons, murder, blood and fire, vials of wrath. The souls of the martyrs invoke vengeance on their persecutors; and all heaven is summoned to rejoice over the downfall of Babylon.

In representing the apostle as retaining his old Judaic prepossessions, as one whose Christianity was of the original type, we are justified by the Apocalypse itself; especially by the descriptions of the Asiatic churches, which contain polemic allusions to Paul and his teachings. Thus in the letter to the church at Ephesus we read: 'Thou hast tried them *which say they are apostles and are not*, and hast found them liars' (ii. 2). The address of the church of Pergamos has: 'I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate' (ii. 14, 15). These Nicolaitanes or Balaamites (for the names are identical) seem to have been Pauline Christians. The first epistle to the Corinthians shows that Paul allowed the use of meats offered in sacrifice to idols; and the Acts, that the leading apostles at Jerusalem enjoined Gentile Christians to abstain from such food. But these followers of Paul pushed his liberalism to excess; for the commission of fornication is also specified. They abused the doctrine of their alleged master, who, while he boldly proclaimed 'all things are lawful for me,' was careful to enjoin virtuous conduct. In like manner, an anti-Pauline tendency is perceptible in the address to the church of Thyatira; the greater part of whom carried the apostle's principles to excess, abusing the liberty allowed to Gentile converts. John still acknowledges the legal burden laid upon them, and tells them to hold it fast.

Besides this anti-Pauline tendency observable in some

of the letters to the churches—a tendency natural in one of the primitive apostles—there are allusions to the existence of antichristian principles in the churches of Smyrna, Philadelphia, and Pergamos. Paul is excluded from the foundation of the church ; and the twelve alone honoured with the insertion of their names in the foundations of the wall round the holy city (xxi. 14). Even in the churches of Asia Minor which Paul had planted, and in some of which he laboured for a considerable time, a reaction had set in, through the presence and influence of John. His apostleship was never cordially allowed by the pillars of the church at Jerusalem, Peter, James, and John ; and the Apocalyptic writer consistently shows his hostility to the doctrine of entire freedom from the law of Moses which the apostle of the Gentiles was the first to proclaim.

The writer's Judaistic position also stands out in the seventh chapter, where the *elders*, whose number is that of the twelve tribes, are a selected body representing the faithful Church of God on earth, and sit upon thrones immediately surrounding Jehovah's, as assessors with judicial functions. They are the elect, the first-fruits to God and the Lamb (vii. 4, 5 ; xii. 1 ; xxi. 12). On the other hand, the saved heathen, though a great multitude, are farther from the Almighty's throne, and distinguished from the former (vii. 13). They are the crowd, an appendix as it were to the representatives of the faithful people. Thus complete equality is not assigned to Jews and Gentiles. Though both are admitted into the Messianic kingdom and new Jerusalem, the latter are put in the second rank. It is true that the 144,000 presented to view in vii. 1–9 ; xiv. 1–5 ; xv. 2–4 may be regarded as the whole multitude of Christians collected out of nations and peoples ; yet even there the universalism has a Judaising aspect, since the number of believers is classified according to the old division of the twelve tribes, and every Christian is put

into one tribe or other. The title to the kingdom of God is bound up with such classification. When they become Christian the heathen are enrolled among the twelve tribes. Thus their formulising proves the apostle's Judaistic view.

The opinion just given of the difference between the 144,000 and the innumerable multitude appears the only tenable one, notwithstanding the argument of Hilgenfeld in proof of their identity. It would be an anomalous thing to specify the number of the sealed as 144,000 and to add immediately the seer's vision of a multitude *which no man could number*, if the two coincided. Dusterdieck, Volkmar, and Krenkel rightly separate them. The 144,000 appear again in xiv. 1, etc. without mention of the countless number of Gentile Christians. As primitive Christianity was developed out of Judaism, its victory assumes in the Apocalypse the outward form of a kingdom co-extensive with the world itself; with Christ reigning in the royal city of Jerusalem; no longer the old apostate Jerusalem which crucified the Lord and is called Sodom and Egypt on that account, but purified and transformed. Though a partiality for the Jews exists, and the twelve tribes reappear in the new Jerusalem in splendour and glory, the apocalyptist regards *Christians* as the only orthodox Jews, having the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus. They are an elect Jewish church which admits the heathen into their communion. The nationality of John had assumed a Christian form. Having abandoned empirical Judaism by teaching that the Judaism which embraced Christ was *the only genuine* one, he was a Jewish Christian of the early type.

It is plain from xii. 1, etc. that John did not dream of the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem, so that he knew nothing of the prophecy contained in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew's gospel. On the contrary, he expects that Jerusalem will be preserved

with its temple, and that its inhabitants will be converted. Though spiritually called Sodom and Gomorrha, it is nevertheless the beloved city renewed and purged.

These remarks prove the thorough incorrectness of Canon Farrar's assertion that 'the essence of the teaching of both apostles (John and Paul) on all the most important aspects of Christianity is almost exactly the same.'[1] A first principle in the right apprehension of the New Testament is the wide distinction in the doctrinal teaching of the original apostles and Paul—a distinction that remained throughout their lives.

Two passages are quoted as adverse to apostolic authorship, viz. xviii. 20 and xxi. 14. In the former, the writer speaks of the holy apostles and prophets rejoicing over the fall of Babylon; in the latter, of the names of the twelve apostles being inscribed on the foundations of the walls of new Jerusalem. It is argued that the apostle would not speak of *the holy* apostles. The right reading, 'ye saints, apostles, and prophets,' dissipates the argument founded upon the passage. As to the latter, the language is not very different from that in 1 Cor. iii. 10, where Paul speaks of himself as a wise master-builder laying the foundation of the church at Corinth. Why then should not John speak of himself as one of the foundations? Is it inconsistent with modesty? If so, did not Zebedee's sons covet the two highest places in Christ's kingdom? A comparison of Paul's own language in the epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians shows that he never lost the feeling of conscious dignity implied in the apostolic office, though he retained his Christian humility. And surely the consciousness of a like dignity was not less among the primitive apostles, as we infer from 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. etc. Neither passage can shake belief in the apostolicity of the work. Another objection to the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse is founded upon the view

[1] *Life and Work of St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 406.

which the writer takes of Christ's person. Hoekstra and Scholten argue that a disciple in personal contact with the master could not have spoken of his divinity as he does, but only of his simple humanity. In answer to this we remark, that Christ is not described as God but 'the beginning of the creation of God' or the first created being (iii. 14). Agreeably to this, he appears by implication as an angel in various parts of the book. In the fourteenth chapter, immediately after he is portrayed as a lamb standing on mount Sion, *another angel* appears in the midst of heaven, etc., alluding to an angel mentioned before, that is, to the lamb. The chapter speaks of the lamb who is afterwards styled *the Son of man* being accompanied with six angels, he himself being the head or chief of them. The twenty-second chapter identifies the angel that showed John the holy city with Christ; for the description passes from his representative to the Messiah without distinction. The same that refuses John's worship and bids him not to seal the prophetic book says forthwith, 'Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me,' etc. etc. (xxii. 12). Thus the Apocalypse makes Christ the first created angel; and if it was believed that angels appeared in the form of men, as we know they did from the book of Tobit, it is not improbable that John thought of the master he saw as an incarnation of the first-born angel.

We may suppose that time changed the apostle's ideas respecting him whom he had formerly known, and given them a higher range. The disciples did not understand their master while he was on earth. Not till he was withdrawn did their thoughts take a new direction. Reflecting upon the wonderful one, they naturally exalted him; assigning him a divine nature and rank. His person was idealised. The imaginative mind of John was specially prone to such views. Poetry elevates and magnifies.

It is almost unnecessary to remark, that the expres-

sion 'throne of God and of the Lamb' (xxii. 1) does not involve the deity of Christ. The thrones of the Father and the Son are separated in iii. 21.

The appellations *Word of God* and *Alpha and Omega* are consistent with a created being, as will be shown hereafter; so that the book presents no portrait of Christ which makes him truly God or uncreated.

So far we have endeavoured to keep the evidence for apostolic authorship distinct from the fourth gospel. But they cannot be separated. Both works have long been current in the Church under the name of John; and comparison is necessary to a full knowledge of either. Their authorship cannot be properly investigated without such mutual references as will place general characteristics and individual points in a better light. It will not satisfy the demands of criticism to assume the non-authenticity of the gospel from the authenticity of the Apocalypse or the reverse, because respectable scholars still maintain identity of authorship. Having shown, as clearly as the nature of the question allows, that the one was composed by the son of Zebedee, it remains for the critic to bring into view resemblances and discrepancies in proof of identity or diversity.

The *christology* of the Apocalypse is *apparently* in unison with that of the gospel. The latter describes Jesus as the incarnate wisdom of God, and the former uses language of similar import (iii. 14, 20). His pre-existence is asserted in the gospel, as it is in Apoc. iii. 14. The appellation *Word*, distinctive of person, occurs only in the gospel, first epistle of John, and Apocalypse.

Christ, or God, is often termed *the true*; so in the gospel Christ is called *the true light*; and God is *the true God* in the first epistle.

In Apoc. ii. 17, Jesus promises believers *the hidden manna*; in the gospel, he is *the true bread from heaven* (vi. 32).

Christ is often styled in our book, *a lamb*; an epithet applied to him nowhere except in the fourth gospel.

In the Apocalypse, it is said of the Jews who reject Jesus, that they are not *true Jews* (iii. 9); so in the fourth gospel (viii. 39, 40).

In ii. 11 a promise is made to *him that overcometh* that he shall not be hurt by the second death; in the fourth gospel, it is said of *him that keeps Jesus's word* that he shall never see death (viii. 51).

In xiv. 15 a call is addressed to the angel to thrust in his sickle and reap, because reaping-time is come and the harvest of the earth is ripe. In the gospel, Jesus says to his disciples, 'Look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest,' iv. 35.

The favourite expression *to testify* and *testimony*[1] of the gospel, in the sense of declaration respecting the Saviour, public profession and declaration of belief in him, is common in the Apocalypse. Compare gospel i. 7, 19; iii. 11, 32, 33; v. 31–36; viii. 13, 14; xviii. 37; xxi. 24. Epistle v. 9 thrice, 10, 11. Rev. i. 2, 9; vi. 9; xii. 11, 17; xix. 10; xx. 4; xxii. 18, 20.

The use of *to conquer*[2] in the sense of overcoming the evil, opposition, and enmity of the world, with the implication of remaining faithful and active in the Christian cause, is peculiar to John and the Apocalypse. Gospel xvi. 33. Epistle ii. 13, 14; iv. 4; v. 4, 5. Apoc. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21; xii. 11; xiii. 7; xxi. 7.

*Countenance*[3] in the sense of human visage, is only found in gospel xi. 44, and Rev. i. 16.

*To keep the word*,[4] is frequent in John's gospel and epistle; the same occurs in the Apocalypse.

*To tabernacle*[5] is used in gospel i. 14, and Apoc. vii. 15; xii. 12; xiii. 6; xxi. 3.

[1] μαρτυρέω and μαρτυρία.
[2] νικᾶν.
[3] ὄψις.
[4] τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον.
[5] σκηνοῦν.

*To slay*,[1] is employed in epistle iii. 12, twice; also in Rev. v. 6; vi. 4, 9, 12; xiii. 3, 8; xviii. 24. It is found nowhere else.

*To have part*,[2] is used in gospel xiii. 8; and Apoc. xx. 6.

*To walk with one*.[3] Gospel vi. 66; Apoc. iii. 4.

*Hereafter*.[4] Gospel i. 52; xiii. 19; xiv. 7; Rev. xiv. 13. Elsewhere only in Matthew.

*To labour*,[5] with the idea of fatigue. Rev. ii. 3; gospel iv. 6.

*To speak with one*.[6] Gospel iv. 27; ix. 37; xiv. 30; Rev. i. 12; iv. 1; x. 8; xvii. 1; xxi. 9, 15 Not elsewhere except once in Mark vi. 50.

*Heaven*,[7] in the gospel and epistle, has almost always the article; less frequently elsewhere. The same remark applies to *Christ*.[8]

*Lord, thou knowest*.[9] Gospel xxi. 15–17 thrice; Rev. vii. 14.

*He answered, saying*.[10] Gospel i. 26; x. 33; Rev. vii. 13.

The frequent use of *light, to enlighten, glory, to appear*,[11] and the like, in a tropical sense, shows a similar colouring of style in the gospel, epistle, and Apocalypse.

The comparison of Christ with a bridegroom in gospel iii. 29, should be placed by the side of Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 2; xxii. 17, chiefly on account of the diction. So of the water of life, Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 17; and gospel iv. 10; vii. 37; of hungering and thirsting, Rev. vii. 16; gospel vi. 35. The image of *cup* for suffering, trial (gospel xviii. 11) is very common in the

[1] σφάττειν.
[2] ἔχειν μέρος.
[3] περιπατεῖν μετά τινος.
[4] ἀπαρτί.
[5] κοπιάω.
[6] λαλεῖν μετά τινος.
[7] οὐρανός.
[8] ὁ Χριστός.
[9] κύριε, σὺ οἶδας.
[10] ἀπεκρίθη λέγων.
[11] φῶς, φωτίζω, δόξα, φαίνω.

Apocalypse. The image of Christ as a shepherd, gospel x. 1, appears in Rev. vii. 17.

*After these things*,[1] for the most part as a mere formula of transition, is a striking feature of resemblance between the Apocalypse and gospel, as gospel iii. 22; v. 1, 14; vi. 1; vii. 1; xiii. 7; xix. 38; xxi. 1. Apoc. i. 19; iv. 1; vii. 1, 9; ix. 12; xv. 5; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xx. 3. Luke employs the same formula but not so frequently.

The Apocalypse has often Hebrew words, with a Greek explanation. This is also done in the gospel, as Rev. iii. 14; ix. 11; xii. 9; xx. 2; xxii. 20; gospel i. 39, 42, 43; ix. 7; xix. 13, 17, and is not so frequent elsewhere.

*To write*, followed by the preposition *to*,[2] before a noun signifying the object on which the writing is made, is peculiar to the Apocalypse and gospel. Apoc. i. 11; gospel viii. 6, 8.

The doctrine of perseverance is common to both writings and is expressed in the same manner. Compare Rev. iii. 12; epistle ii. 19; gospel vi. 37.

The use of *to signify*[3] deserves notice. Gospel xii. 33; xviii. 32; xxi. 19; Apoc. i. 1.

The neuter gender is used to denote rational beings, in gospel vi. 37, 39; xvii. 2, 10. So *creature*,[4] in Rev. v. 13; *every*,[5] xxi. 27.

John alone has given an account of piercing Jesus's side with a spear, to which he applies the prediction in Zech. xii. 10. Apoc. i. 7 exhibits the same Greek version of the Hebrew as the gospel does. The version being a new one, not that of the Seventy, betrays the same hand in both.

In Apoc. vii. 15, he that sits upon the throne is said *to dwell* among the saints; an idea similar to that in the gospel xiv. 23, where the Father and Son are said *to*

[1] μετὰ ταῦτα. [2] γράφειν followed by εἰς. [3] σημαίνω. [4] κτίσμα. [5] πᾶν.

*take up their abode* with the believer. The same thought is in Apoc. iii. 20 ; xxi. 22 ; xxii. 5.

The manner of writing in the Apocalypse, often reminds one of that in the fourth gospel and first epistle, where the same idea is expressed positively and negatively ; and there is a certain parallelism of thought and expression.

More specimens of resemblance have been collected by Donker-Curtius,[1] Dannemann,[2] Kolthoff,[3] and Stuart[4] to prove identity of authorship. But the most striking and plausible have been given, and the reader must judge of their validity. Some are far-fetched. Stuart's list needs sifting, because he does not scruple to use the 21st chapter of the fourth gospel throughout, as if it were a genuine part of the work, though Lücke and others prove that it is not. It is easy to see the weakness of Stuart's reasoning when he asserts that John is familiar with the neuter noun *lamb* ;[5] whereas it occurs but once in the gospel, and that in the 21st chapter. In short, his examples sometimes fail to support his assertions ; as under the head of Christ's *omniscience*, where some irrelevant places are quoted from the gospel and Apocalypse. Yet after every reasonable deduction, enough remains to prove that the correspondences are not accidental ; they either betray the same author or show that the one was influenced by the ideas and language of the other. The true explanation is the last. The later writer knew the earlier work and used it. Some expressions in the gospel remind the reader at once of similar ones in the Revelation ; but these specimens of borrowed accord are not important ; and detract little from the fundamental dissimilarity of the

[1] *De Apocalypsi ab indole, doctrina et scribendi genere Johannis apostoli non abhorrente*, 1799.

[2] *Wer ist der Verfasser der Offenbarung Johannis?* 1841.

[3] *Apocalypsis Joanni apostolo vindicata*, 1834.

[4] *A Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. 1845, vol. i.

[5] ἀρνίον.

two productions. Comparison brings out greater unlikeness than the opposite. It is even difficult to compare them, because they are so different. Visions and revelations, angels and superhuman figures, dramatic scenes which usher in the dread coming of Christ to destroy his people's persecutors and establish the blessedness of the saints, are remote from glimpses of the incarnate word in his brief sojourn on earth, the world's hatred of its true light, its only life-giving power, its one access to God ; extremely remote from the theological discourses and sublime prayer of the only-begotten Son. But the affinities, such as they are, need not be explained away, nor their full force attenuated.

The internal relation of the two books to one another rather than their external form shows the side on which originality lies. The Apocalypse exhibits a tendency akin to what is known as Christianity in its first stage, or Ebionitism ; whereas progression belongs to the gospel. The development of the religious conception commonly begins with the sensuous and concrete, which it seeks to spiritualise and make abstract. It needs no argument to prove that the ideas and expressions common to the two works have a more spiritual bearing in the gospel. The evangelist purposely adopts the apocalyptic forms even after their original signification had been laid aside. He wished his work to pass for that of the apostle.

The most marked coincidence is apparently in the christology. Here three particulars bear considerable resemblance to the fourth gospel, viz. Christ's designation as *the beginning of the creation of God* ;[1] the attribution to him of the name *Jehovah* ; and the appellation, *Word of God*.[2] The first implies his pre-existence. As it has parallels in the Pauline epistles, we think it hazardous, with Zeller, to regard the phrase as a mere honorary title rather than a doctrinal predicate.

[1] ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. [2] ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Though it be obscure, it is best to take it in the sense of *the first created being* or the highest creature. But the fourth gospel makes the Logos or Word to have *formed all things*. Again, Jesus or the Messiah is expressly termed the Alpha and Omega, which is a periphrasis for Jehovah; and the new name, which none knows but himself, is the unutterable name, the *Shem hamphorash*. The name does not imply that the *nature* of Jehovah belongs to Messiah. It is an old Rabbinic tradition,[1] that the appellation Jehovah belongs to three things, the Messiah, the righteous, and Jerusalem; which is proved by Jerem. xxiii. 6; Isai. xliii. 7; Ezek. xlviii. 35. The apocalyptist probably alludes to this tradition, because the faithful are represented as having the name of God and of the new Jerusalem, and the new name of Messiah written on their foreheads, which name is Jehovah. The angel *Metatron*[2] in Jewish doctrine is also called Jehovah; showing that the title is given to creatures.

The Messiah is called *the Word of God* in the Apocalypse (xix. 13); in the gospel he is *the Word* absolutely. The two phrases show a different theological standpoint; the former savouring of Palestinian, the latter of Alexandrian, metaphysics. The one is the well-known *Memra of Jehovah*[3] so frequent in the Targums; the other resembles Philo's idea.

Similarity of expression has led some critics to assume greater agreement between the descriptions of Christ in the gospel and Apocalypse than really exists. The heavenly nature and pre-existence of Messiah was a later Jewish doctrine, which was gradually taken into the circle of Christian ideas and developed there. This doctrine appears first in the book of Daniel, i.e. between 170–160 B.C.; and reaches a higher stage in the gospel than in the Revelation. The most striking mutual term

[1] See Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, vol. i. p. 449.

[2] Gfrörer's *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, vol. i. pp. 318, 319.

[3] מֵימְרָא דְיְיָ

is that rendered *pierce*,[1] the new representative of a Hebrew verb[2] in Zech. xii. 10, which is applied in both to the piercing of the Saviour, and differs from the Septuagint word. It is a precarious thing to found identity of authorship on the use of a mere term; but its connexion is peculiar. We might conjecture, with Ewald, that the Septuagint had it at first; but the assumption is hazardous. Nor does it remove the difficulty felt by those who argue against identity of authorship, to say that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion translate the Hebrew verb by this very apocalyptic one; or that the evangelist refers to the piercing of Christ's side with a spear, whereas the apocalyptist alludes to his slaying generally—the extreme manifestation of hostile belief.[3]

On the other hand, the characteristic method in which the writer of the Apocalypse views beings, scenes, and objects, betrays a different person from the evangelist. His intuitions are of another cast. The views of the one are sensuous; of the other, spiritual and mystic. In the apocalyptist, fancy is creative and lively; calmness prevails in the evangelist. The objective predominates in the one; speculation, depth, gracious trust, a loving freedom of spirit, in the other. The one is introspective, looking at spiritual relations with a fine psychological organisation; the other is of rougher mould, viewing things in concrete, plastic forms. Quiet contemplation has full scope in the evangelist; mildness and love find utterance in affectionate discourse. But the spirit of the apocalyptist is stern and vengeful. He issues cutting reproofs, calls to repentance, commands and threatens; though there are rich and pregnant promises suited to the majesty of the book. According to the writer of the fourth gospel, happiness arises from faith in the Saviour on earth and

[1] ἐκκεντέω. [2] דָּקַר.

[3] Dusterdieck, *Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannis*, p. 110.

therefore blessedness is a present possession ; according to the apocalyptist, the righteous pray for vengeance, and are restored to life in the first resurrection that they may reign with Christ a thousand years. The gospel presents an idealising, universalist tendency, which breaks away from the Judaic basis and sets the Redeemer's person, grace, and truth, over against Moses, proclaiming the former as the life and light of the world. In the Apocalypse, Christ is the conqueror of his enemies ; and his power is exhibited more than his grace. His coming to reign outwardly, rather than his spiritual abode in the heart, fills the mind of the seer. Besides, a sharp, definite, decisive tone appears in sentences short, unconnected, without internal pliancy. The evangelist's mode of writing has a circumstantiality foreign to the apocalyptist. It is difficult to make this argument palpable, because it rests in part on subjective tact and taste, so that its reality can be felt more easily than described. Based on a careful survey of the literature that passes under the name of John, it forces itself on the mind. As soon as one perceives the difference of the spiritual elements in which the evangelist and the apocalyptist move, their characteristic modes of apprehension and the views they take of religious phenomena, expressed in different styles and diction, he infers that the one cannot be identified with the other. Power and majesty, poetic energy and fancy, are hardly consistent with a philosophic idealism permeated and occasionally concealed by emotional tenderness. The fervour of the evangelist is not fiery ; it is subdued by love. A charm lies in his composition. He has refinement and philosophical culture. A solemn grandeur and sensuous symbolism appear in the Apocalypse. Can any reader doubt that the long series of plagues preceding the coming of the Lord, and introduced by demoniacal beings such as scorpion-like locusts or lion-headed horses, with fire smoke and brimstone issuing out of their mouths,

and strange riders upon them, is objective and artificial imagery foreign to the evangelist's idiosyncrasy?

These observations prepare the reader to find the *doctrinal* type of the book before us unlike that of the fourth gospel. In *eschatology*, it has a first and second resurrection, a thing unknown to other parts of the New Testament.[1] In like manner, the idea of antichrist differs in the Apocalypse and first epistle of John. The antichrist of the former is a notable instrument of Satan; the antichrist of the latter is a plurality of persons who destroy Christianity from within. The term is applied to false teachers, and therefore antichrist is said to have already appeared. The antichrist of the apocalyptist is outside Christianity, a power that hates both Jews and Christians.

The doctrine of *redemption*, as far as allusions to it enable us to judge, is more Jewish than it is in the gospel. It is represented by the strong Jewish figure of *washing in blood*; but other terms belonging to it, such as, *lamb*, *buy*, *called*, *freely*,[2] resemble Paul. Early Christianity was strongly impregnated with Old Testament ideas of sacrifice and atonement which were more sensuous than spiritual; and time was required for leavening it with purer conceptions. The love of God in sending his Son into the world to be the life and light of men, quickening in them that higher principle which sin debases, gradually broke through the ideas of propitiation inherited from their fathers by the Jewish Christians.

Though the apocalyptist wrote in Greek, he followed Hebrew sources, especially the later prophets, Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, fourth Esdras, the Ascension of Moses, and perhaps the book of Enoch. He is so thoroughly Judaic that there are examples of what was afterwards developed in a corrupt form under the name

[1] Luke xiv. 14 is no exception. See Meyer.

[2] ἀρνίον, ἀγοράζειν, κλητοί, δωρεάν.

of Kabbala in Judaism, as in xiii. 18, where the mysterious number of the beast sounds like *Gematria*. The sacred number seven, which enters into the plan of the book as well as three, savours of Kabbalism. So does the description of the heavenly Jerusalem in the last two chapters.

The view of *angels*, *demons*, and *spirits* is also Jewish, unlike that of the fourth gospel. Seven spirits are said to be before the throne of the Almighty (i. 4), meaning the seven highest spirits ; an idea taken from the Zoroastrian religion into the Jewish, as we see from Zechariah (iv. 2–10), but modified in the Hebrew conception, so that the seven spirits here represent the one Spirit of God. So intimately are these seven associated with the Supreme, that grace and peace are invoked from them. An angel interpreter waits upon John ; seven angels sound trumpets and the same number pour out vials full of the divine wrath ; an angel comes down from heaven ; an angel stands on the sea ; an angel has a book in his hand ; an angel takes up a great stone ; an angel of the waters appears. Lücke remarks correctly, that the fourth gospel employs angels on moral and spiritual errands only ; while the Apocalypse places them over the phenomena of nature. It is inappropriate to quote, as Stuart does, the angel at the pool of Bethesda, in proof of the gospel representing angelic control over the material elements, because the passage is spurious. But Hengstenberg adduces the place, without the least hint of its interpolation. This angelology, with a strong likeness to the apocalyptic Daniel and Enoch, plays an important part in the Revelation. We admit that the envelope of visions in which the author clothes his Messianic hopes required some spiritual machinery like that of angels ; but they are introduced so frequently, and the representations of them are so peculiar, as to show another idiosyncrasy than the evangelist's. The view of demons is also singular.

Three unclean spirits issue from the mouths of the three confederate beasts; and these are termed the spirits of demons, seducing the kings of the earth by bringing them to join the antichristian leader. In like manner, Satan is conspicuous in the Apocalypse; he is even chained and loosed again; he is the great dragon, the arch-enemy of the faithful, the leader of other spirits; with whom he is cast from heaven to earth, and is said to have accused the brethren before God continually. Some of these ideas resemble Pauline ones, but are unlike anything in the fourth gospel.

The language of the book is different from that of the fourth gospel. It departs materially from the usual Greek of the New Testament, presenting anomalies, incorrectnesses, peculiar constructions, and awkward dispositions of words which have no parallel. These originate in Hebraism; the Greek being so moulded by Hebrew as to follow its constructions. The fact does not disagree with John's authorship, though in the Acts he is called an 'unlearned and ignorant man' (iv. 13); such epithets signifying no more than that he was a layman, destitute of Rabbinic learning. But the circumstances in which this opinion of the council was formed, deprive it of all weight.

With respect to *cases*, the unusual licence is taken of discontinuing the genitive for a nominative, as in iii. 12; xiv. 12;[1] or the accusative for a nominative, as in xx 2.[2] In vii. 9 the nominative is discontinued for the accusative.[3]

Greek usage is often violated in *gender* and *number*, as in vi. 9, 10; ix. 13, 14.[4] Neuters plural take plural verbs, xi. 18; xv. 4. The same nouns are both masculine and feminine in iv. 3; x. 1; xiv. 19.[5] In xii. 5 *man child* [6] is an imitation of a Hebrew phrase.

[1] *τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα, κ.τ.λ.—τῶν ἁγίων οἱ τηροῦντες.*
[2] *τὸν δράκοντα, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος.*
[3] *ὄχλος . . . ἑστῶτες . . . περιβεβλημένους.*
[4] *τὰς ψυχὰς . . . λέγοντες—φωνὴν . . . λέγοντα.*
[5] *ληνός, ἶρις.* [6] *υἱὸς ἄρσην* for זָכָר בֵּן.

In regard to *verbs*, the apocalyptist uses the future like the Hebrew imperfect, in a frequentative sense, as at iv. 9–11. The participle stands for a finite tense in i. 16; while the present passes into the future in i. 7; or into the past, xii. 2–4. Future and past tenses are strangely mixed in xx. 7–10.

In the syntax of nouns the plural stands regularly for the dual, as in xii. 14.[1]

The genitive is always put after a noun to explain it, in the manner of an adjective; and a number of genitives are linked together at xvi. 19.[2]

Two nouns coupled by a conjunction have each its own suffix, as in vi. 11;[3] ix. 21.

The repetition of a preposition with each connected genitive often occurs, xvi. 13.[4]

The genitive absolute seems wanting, unless there be an example in ix. 9, which is doubtful.

The preposition *in*[5] is almost always prefixed to the dative of the instrument, as in vi. 8.

The usage of the writer in prepositions and conjunctions is altogether Hebraised. Thus we have the nominative after *as*,[6] where another case should have stood, iv. 7.[7] This is from a Hebrew prefix.[8]

The verb *to teach*[9] is followed by a dative case, ii. 14, like the Hebrew;[10] *to avenge*, vi. 10,[11] has a preposition with the genitive equivalent to Hebrew usage;[12] and *to follow with* (vi. 8[13]) is also Hebraic. Greek and Hebrew constructions are strangely intermingled in xvii. 4.[14]

These examples show that the language is so tho-

[1] δύο πτέρυγες.

[2] τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[3] οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν.

[4] ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ ψευδοπροφήτου.

[5] ἐν. [6] ὡς. [7] ἔχων πρόσωπον ὡς ἄνθρωπος.

[8] בְּ [9] διδάσκειν. [10] לִמֵּד לְ [11] ἐκδικεῖν ἐκ.

[12] נָקַם מִן [13] ἀκολουθεῖν μετά, like הָלַךְ אַחַר.

[14] γέμον βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα.

roughly Hebraistic as to neglect the usual rules of Greek. It is grammatically irregular and syntactically harsh. Yet Winer says, 'The irregularities of government and apposition which occur in the Revelation (especially in the descriptions of visions), and which from their number and nature give the style the impress of considerable harshness, are partly intended, and partly traceable to the writer's negligence. From a Greek point of view they may be explained as instances of anacoluthon, blending of two constructions, *constructio ad sensum*, *variatio structuræ*. In this light they should have been always considered, instead of being attributed to the ignorance of the writer, or even regarded as Hebraisms; since most of them would be faulty in Hebrew, and in producing many of them, Hebrew could have had but an indirect influence. But with all his simplicity and oriental tone of diction, the author knows and observes well the rules of Greek syntax; even in imitating Hebrew expressions he proceeds cautiously. Besides, examples analogous to many of these roughnesses occur in the Septuagint, and even in Greek authors, though certainly not in so quick succession as in the Apocalypse.'[1] This language is apologetic to incorrectness. The same scholar attempts elsewhere to justify and parallel what cannot be done in the measure he proposes.[2] After all endeavours to find analogies to the linguistic peculiarities and departures from good Greek usage in the book before us, either in the New Testament or classical writers, anomalies of such nature and in such number present themselves, as separate the author from the evangelist. Hebrew-Greek like his is unique.

The apologies offered by some critics for the writer's curious Greek are exemplified in Professor Stuart, who often misapprehends the true state of the question. Yet

[1] *Grammatik*, siebente Auflage, pp. 497–8.
[2] *Exegetische Studien*, i. p. 154, *et seq.*

he has to confess the uniqueness of expressions in the work, as in xxii. 2, where no parallel is forthcoming;[1] and in ii. 13, where he would drop a word out of the text.[2] 'Is not the Apocalypse,' he asks, 'the production of an excited state of mind and of the most vivid feeling? Is it not *prophetic poetry*?' This reasoning applied to the Old Testament prophets would justify the expectation of frequent and peculiar Hebrew constructions in them. Do they not write the same kind of Hebrew as the historians and poets? Does any one violate Hebrew construction extensively because he was in an excited state of mind? We must not deprive the apocalyptist of conscious calmness when he wrote. The very fact indeed of his writing in Greek and following Hebrew so much, is against the peculiarities he exhibits.

The characteristic differences now stated between the apocalyptist and evangelist should be considered in their bearing on authorship. Perhaps some may still think them consistent with identity. But the argument is strong against it. Does not absence of the evangelist's *characteristic* expressions, or of such at least as suit apocalyptic ideas, betray another writer? Does not the new form of the evangelist's terms, and their new applications, show diversity? Thus the apocalyptist uses a noun *lamb*,[3] which never occurs in the gospel; the latter having the phrase *Lamb of God*.[4] The verb *overcome*[5] is common to the two; but a definite object accompanies it in the gospel, as *the world*, *the evil one*; while the Revelation uses it absolutely. The gospel has one word for *liar*,[6] the Apocalypse a kindred but not identical one.[7] The latter has the noun Jerusalem[8] singular and indeclinable; the former plural and declined.[9] *Behold* is written differently in the two.[10]

The phraseology of the apocalyptist is characterised

[1] μὴν εἷς ἕκαστος.
[2] ὅς.
[3] ἀρνίον.
[4] ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.
[5] νικᾶν.
[6] ψεύστης.
[7] ψεύδης.
[8] Ἱερουσαλήμ.
[9] Ἱεροσόλυμα.
[10] Ἰδού, ἴδε.

by such expressions as *ἡ οἰκουμένη, οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς* applied to Christ, *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, κρατεῖν τὸ ὄνομα, τὴν διδαχήν; παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*, all foreign to the evangelist; whereas the favourite ideas and expressions of the latter—*ἡ ἀλήθεια, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, ὁ κόσμος, ὁ πονηρός, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι* or *γεννηθῆναι, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, σκοτία* and *φῶς* contrasted, *περιπατεῖν, θεᾶσθαι* and *θεωρεῖν, ἐργάζεσθαι, μένειν* and *μονή, φωνεῖν, ἐκεῖνος, πάλιν καθώς, δοξάζεσθαι* and *ὑψοῦσθαι, ταράσσειν, παῤῥησία, πιστεύειν*—do not appear in the Apocalypse or very seldom.

The diversities now given, doctrinal, theological, and linguistic, are explained by apologists consistently with one authorship. Donker-Curtius, Kolthoff, Dannemann, and Stuart try to find either the same or similar expressions in both, overlooking those which are *characteristic*; or discover reasons for the diversities, which amount to three—difference of subject, of age, and of mental state.

The first of these has some weight. The Apocalypse is a prophetic book in the main. It describes the future in poetic colours. Yet in the epistles to the seven churches which are of the same character with John's first epistle and should be a fair subject of comparison, diversity is more prominent than likeness. A different tone and style appear. The compositions are *characteristically* different.

The argument of age urged by Olshausen and Guericke has little force. Written as they believe twenty years before the fourth gospel, the Revelation shows marks of inexperience in composition, as well as of an ardent temperament and youthful fire. It is like the first essay of one expressing his ideas in a language to which he was unaccustomed. But the author must

have been about sixty years of age when he wrote, a time when inexperience and youthful fire are past; and the language of the Apocalypse bears no evidence of a beginner's bungling attempt. On the contrary it has the marks of a consistent and settled usage—of a definite type hardly consistent with the transformation involved in the linguistic phenomena of the gospel.[1] Kolthoff's comparison of the earlier and later epistles of Paul shows that time is insufficient to account for the characteristic differences between the evangelist and apocalyptist. Nothing but the hypothesis of two persons can explain them; and the alleged analogy is beside the mark.

Others find the chief cause of diversity in the phrase *I was in the Spirit* (i. 10). Thus Hengstenberg supposes that John was in an *ecstatic* state; or at least in a passive or receptive condition of mind. The visions and their colouring were *given*, says Ebrard; whereas John's own reflectiveness appears in the fourth gospel. His mind was active in the one, passive in the other. We object to this assumption, because it deprives the author of consciousness and is contrary to the analogy of prophecy. The Old Testament seers were never without consciousness even in their highest moments of inspiration. Their own individuality appears, each retaining his characteristic peculiarities of conception and language. Ezekiel and Zechariah had visions; yet their own reflectiveness is manifest. So it was with the author of the Revelation, whom we must not convert into an unconscious machine controlled by the Spirit. Had he written down the visions at the time he received them, the idea that he was overpowered by the substance of the communications might appear more plausible; but the fact of their not being composed in Patmos shows that their present form proceeded from later reflection.

[1] See Lücke's *Einleitung*, p. 664, 2nd ed.

We conclude that whatever deductions be made on the ground that the work is prophetic poetry not prose; that the author was a younger man when he wrote the Apocalypse; that the character of his inspiration was higher, his object different; and that he should not be restricted to the same circle of ideas and language; enough remains to show another than the evangelist. There are two idiosyncrasies, which minor coincidences do not neutralise.

The weight of external evidence is in favour of apostolic authorship. If therefore John wrote the Revelation, he did not write the fourth gospel. Yet some of the ablest German scholars have doubted or denied John's authorship. Keim and Scholten necessarily reject it. Volkmar also conjectures, that it was written by a disciple of John. It is sufficient to refer to Krenkel's refutation of Scholten and Keim's extreme view.

At the time of the Reformation, Erasmus intimated his suspicions, thinking it strange that one writing revelations should repeat his name so carefully, *I John, I John*, as if he were drawing out a bond not a book, which is contrary both to the usage of other apostles and his own; for in the gospel he speaks more modestly and never gives his name. When Paul is forced to speak of his visions, he explains the thing in the person of another. Erasmus proceeds to say, that in the Greek copies he had seen, the title was of *John the divine* not *John the evangelist*; and that the language is not a little different from that of the gospel and first epistle.[1] Luther speaks more decidedly against the apostle's authorship. 'More than one thing presents itself in this book, as a reason why I hold it to be neither apostolic nor prophetic. First and most of all, that the prophets do not concern themselves with visions, but with prophecy, in clear, plain words, as Peter, Paul, and Christ in the gospel do; for it belongs to the apo-

[1] *Annotationes in Apocalypsin Joannis, Novum Testamentum*, ed. 1, p. 625.

stolic office, clearly and without image or vision to speak about Christ and his work. Moreover, there is no prophet in the Old Testament, not to speak of the New, who is occupied with visions throughout; so that I almost imagine to myself a fourth book of Esdras before me, and certainly can find no reason for believing that it was set forth by the Holy Spirit. Besides, it seems to me far too arrogant in him to enjoin it upon his readers to regard his own as of more importance than any other sacred book, and to threaten that if any one shall take aught away from it, God will take away from him his part in the book of life. Moreover, even were it a blessed thing to believe what is contained in it, no man knows what that is. The book is believed in (and is really just the same to us) as though we had it not; and many nobler books exist for us to believe in. . . . But let every man think of it as his spirit prompts him. My spirit cannot adapt itself to the production; and this is reason enough for me that I should not highly esteem it, that Christ is neither thought of nor perceived in it; which is the great business of an apostle.'[1] Though he used milder language afterwards, Luther never retracted his doubts.

Zwingli would not accept passages in proof from the Apocalypse, 'because it is not a biblical book,' i.e. a canonical one. Œcolampadius and Bucer seem to have had the same opinion. Carlstadt shared their doubts. Michaelis assigned reasons for the negative view. Many others have followed in the same path, including Lücke, Ewald, Neander, Bleek, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. These deserve respect for their learning and integrity; nor should any critical opinion of theirs be dismissed summarily. De Wette's axiomatic principle is right, that if the apostle wrote the fourth gospel he did not write the Apocalypse. Believing therefore that he was not the author of the former, we hold that he wrote the

[1] *Preface to the Revelation*, 1522.

latter, especially as external evidence supports us. The critical sagacity of those who attribute both to John cannot be applauded.

Credner, Bleek, and Ewald assign the book to John the presbyter—a hypothesis contrary to external and supported by no internal evidence. No probability belongs to the hypothesis of Hitzig, that the author is John Mark from whom the second gospel proceeded ;[1] his arguments being based on analogies of language and construction which are overpowered by weightier phenomena.

### TIME AND PLACE.

There is some difficulty in discovering the time and place of writing. The prevailing opinion has been that the book was composed A.D. 95 or 96 at Patmos, under Domitian ; or in the reign of Nerva his successor. This accords with the tradition that John was banished to Patmos towards the close of Domitian's reign, where he had the visions described in the book. The fact of his exile to Patmos is mentioned by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. Irenæus calls the emperor Domitian ; Clement and Origen style him the *tyrant* or *king* of the Romans. Epiphanius makes him Claudius ; the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, Nero ; with which Theophylact agrees. The author of the *Synopsis concerning the Life and Death of the Prophets, Apostles, and Disciples of the Lord*, said to be Dorotheus bishop of Tyre, calls him Trajan. The oldest form of the tradition is in Irenæus, viz. that the apostle saw and wrote the visions towards the end of Domitian's reign, in Patmos, to which island he had been banished. Later writers made a distinction between the time of banishment and composition, referring the latter to Ephesus, after the emperor's death. The

[1] *Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften*, 1843.

tradition is inconsistent with itself and will not stand criticism. Yet we cannot agree with those who think it unhistorical, and assign its origin to the words of i. 9. The expressions 'for the word of God,' 'for the testimony of Jesus Christ,' compared with their use in vi. 9 ; xii. 11 ; xx. 4, imply banishment or persecution.

In the absence of external evidence, internal considerations come to our aid. The book shows that Jerusalem had not been destroyed ; if it had, the catastrophe could scarcely have been unnoticed. An event pregnant with momentous consequences to the cause of truth and the fortunes of the early Christians, would have been mentioned. There are distinct allusions to *impending* judgment. We see from xi. 1–14, that the holy city with the temple was not destroyed ; for it is there stated that a part of it should perish, while the temple is supposed to be still standing. Had both been destroyed, the fact would have been noticed. This is confirmed by xvii. 10 : 'And there are seven kings ; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come;' i.e. when the writer lived, five emperors had fallen, the sixth was reigning, and the other had not yet come. The series begins with Octavianus, so that Galba is the sixth, 'the king that is.' The fallen ones are Octavianus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero ; the seventh coming one means returning Nero, as appears from xiii. 3, 14. Other critics begin the series with Julius Cæsar, and make Nero the sixth. This is the view of Bertholdt and Köhler. Galba is then the seventh, and he reigned but seven months. This reckoning is faulty, since Julius Cæsar was not an Augustus ; nor was it till Octavianus and his successors that the Romans ruled over Jerusalem. Others begin with Octavianus, but make the sixth Vespasian ; Otho, Galba, and Vitellius being passed over. It is arbitrary to omit these names. The most probable view is, that the book was composed under Galba after Nero's death ; and this agrees best

with the words 'the beast that was, and is not, and yet is' (xvii. 8). The phrase *is not*, shows that the person alluded to was no longer living. It cannot be referred to the future on the ground that the prophets employ the present for the future in predicting, though Stuart adopts that expedient. The author is not predicting, but simply explaining who the beast is.

The early date, i.e. that soon after Nero, not the late one in Domitian's reign, is usually allowed at the present time. We fix it between June 9, A.D. 68, when Nero died, and January 15, A.D. 69, when Galba was murdered. But some conservative theologians, like Hengstenberg and Hofmann, cling to the Domitianic reign, which most English commentators adopt.

The place where John wrote was Asia Minor, probably Ephesus itself. The visions were received in the barren island, and afterwards committed to writing at Ephesus, as is probable from the past tense of the verb in i. 9. This is favoured, among other circumstances, by the address of the epistles to the seven churches.

The chief arguments adduced against an earlier date, such as the time of Galba or Nero, are the following :—

(*a.*) Nero's persecution did not extend to the provinces.

Were it necessary to speak of the extent of Nero's persecution, we might refer to Tertullian, who mentions *the laws*[1] of Nero and Domitian against the Christians ; an expression, says Milman,[2] too distinct to pass for rhetoric, even in that passionate writer ; and to Orosius, who expressly testifies to its extension beyond Rome.[3] But it cannot well be maintained that the Neronian persecution was other than partial. The examples of suffering mentioned in the epistles to the seven churches of

[1] *Commentarios.*

[2] *The History of Christianity*, p. 188 *note*, ed. Murdock, New York.

[3] 'Romæ Christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit.'—*Adversus Paganos*, lib. vii. 7.

Asia Minor do not need, for their explanation, the extension of such persecution to the provinces of the empire. That a martyr called Antipas had suffered at Pergamos even in Nero's reign, need not excite surprise. Individual Christians may have suffered in the provinces even before Nero. Heathen magistrates, as well as Jews, were ready to put forth their enmity, even when imperial edicts forbad injury to the persons of Christians.

(*b.*) It is also said, that the Nicolaitans did not form a sect as early as A.D. 68 or 69, whereas they are spoken of as such.

Irenæus mentions the Nicolaitans in his time, deriving the name from the deacon Nicolas (Acts. vi.), and referring the allusion in the Apocalypse to them. Other fathers adopt the same view, without troubling themselves about its incredibility. There is no proof that they were *a sect*; or that Nicolas the proselyte of Antioch was its founder. The writer finds a resemblance between them and Balaam who taught the Israelites to eat things offered to idols and commit adultery. This parallel suggests the idea that they were Pauline Christians who carried the opinions of the apostle to excess—antinomians who abused the doctrine of free grace. Instead of being a heretical sect, they were Gentile Christians who probably constituted a considerable part of the church in Pergamos. The name Nicolaitans is symbolical, being formed with reference to the word Balaam. It does not refer to the followers of one Nicolas, but to Paul and his disciples; to whom the opprobrious names of Balaam, Nicolas, and Jezebel were applied, because he overcame and deluded the people, in the opinion of fanatical Jewish Christians.[1]

(*c.*) The condition of the seven churches shows that they had been founded a considerable time; which disagrees with an early date of the book. In answer to

[1] בִּלְעָם from בָּלַע עַם *to swallow up* or *destroy the people*; Νικολαΐται from νικᾶν λαόν.

this argument, it may be stated that the Ephesian church may have soon left its first love. It was planted before A.D. 61; and the ardour of converts is liable to cool quickly under trying circumstances. The patience for which they are commended refers, as the context shows, to the temptations from corrupting teachers, and the difficulties attendant on the faithful exercise of discipline in the church. The case of the church at Smyrna was similar.

### CLASS OF WRITINGS TO WHICH THE APOCALYPSE BELONGS.

Pareus seems to have been the first who thought the book a prophetic drama. A similar opinion was afterwards held by Hartwig, who terms it a symbolical dramatic poem. The genius of Eichhorn elaborated this view with much ability; so that the hypothesis of its being a regular dramatic poem is usually associated with his name. He makes the following divisions: the title i. 1–3; the prologue i. 4–iv. 22; the drama in three acts preceded by a prelude, iv. 1–xxii. 5. The prelude consists of iv. 1–viii. 5. The first act sets forth, in three scenes, the destruction of Jerusalem, the overturning of Judaism, and the Church's weak condition after that catastrophe (viii. 6–xii. 17). The second act represents the downfall of heathenism (xii. 18–xx. 10). The third act describes the heavenly Jerusalem descending from heaven (xx. 11–xxii. 5). The epilogue contains a threefold address—that of the angel, of Christ, and of John (xxii. 6–11).[1] This theory needs no confutation at the present day. It is ingenious but baseless. Stuart calls the poem an *epopee*, a name as objectionable as *drama*.

[1] *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis*, tom. i. p. 19, *et seq.*; and *Einleit. in das neue Testament*, vol. ii. § 190, p. 369, *et seq.*

### THE OBJECT FOR WHICH THE APOSTLE WROTE.

The object of the writer was to set forth the immediate coming of the Lord, in order to support his fellow-Christians under calamities already endured and still impending, to foster hope and discourage apostasy. The world had shown its opposition to the truth, and would exhibit still greater hostility. Hence believers in Christ were encouraged to look for His speedy reappearance, and to hold fast their profession. By steadfast adherence to the gospel, the redeemed should receive the blessed reward which their Master had to bestow. The circumstances seemed sufficiently alarming. The misery of war, the terrors of frequent executions, the perplexities of political affairs, anxious hopes and fears of the future, had produced great excitement among the Christians, and especially such as had not attained to the spiritual views of Paul, in whose sight Judaism had become a thing of the past. The believers in Palestine and Jewish Christians generally looked for a great revolution, which, beginning with the purification of Jerusalem and the downfall of Rome, should issue in the return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of the world, and the establishment of a Messianic kingdom. Their hopes were raised to the highest pitch. Christ indeed had come once but that event fell short of their desires. The humbleness of his person disappointed many who sighed for a more glorious manifestation. The heathen seemed to have concentrated their strength against the followers of the new religion. Calamities already endured looked as though they were the prelude to greater. The atmosphere was lowering. Well might the disciples of Jesus tremble. Some had fallen away, needing repentance and return to their first love. The weak had yielded to temptation. Hence it was necessary to reprove as

well as console, to censure as well as to encourage. The *central idea* of the book is the Lord's second coming, which constitutes its prophetic character. Christ will soon appear to destroy His enemies and reward His followers in that new kingdom which He is to establish. The time is at hand, and therefore there is no cause for despair. The period of endurance is short. Such is the sum of the seer's writing. Nothing was better fitted to make John's readers steadfast in the faith. The great event that formed the consummation of their hopes, the expected redemption to which their weary souls turned for solace, was nigh. The suffering may have sorrowfully thought that they should not be able to stand the shock of their enemies; but the writer points to the triumph of truth and righteousness. Exalted honours, glorious rewards, await the Christian soldier who endures to the end. The patient believer shall receive a crown of victory, the Redeemer's approval, everlasting happiness in Messiah's peaceful kingdom. With Him he shall reign continually. The book arose out of specific circumstances, and was meant to serve a definite object. When the lot of the apostle was cast in troublous times, what better theme could he have to strengthen and comfort his fellow-disciples than their Lord's speedy reappearance?

If the doctrinal idea which pervades the book be the coming of Christ to set up His kingdom, the catastrophe which was to usher in the event must necessarily be introduced. That kingdom is realised in the new Jerusalem, the conception of which is at once earthly and heavenly. Glorified earth is the heaven of the Apocalypse. This is inferior to the kingdom of heaven announced by Jesus. The new Jerusalem is a resuscitation of the old gorgeously renovated and adorned; showing that the seer could not divest himself of sensuous ideas. Heaven, according to him, is not a state beyond the present earthly one in which complete happiness exists; it

is another condition of the earthly. The present and future commingle in a picture painted on material ground.

But what shall be said of the writer's belief in the immediate reappearance of Christ? Was he mistaken about the nearness of the event? History has proved that he was. 'I believe,' says an able lecturer on the book, 'that the time of which St. John wrote was at hand when he wrote. I as little suppose him to have been mistaken about its nearness, as I suppose him to have been a wilful deceiver.' If this be correct, Christ's coming is apprehended in an unnatural and allegorical sense, for it is explained away into the events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem and the subsequent triumph of Christianity; whereas the writer of the Apocalypse attached the advent to that catastrophe. He did not suppose, any more than Paul, that the one was identical with the other, or that the coming of Christ was aught else than personal,—for the purpose of destroying his enemies, and setting up a new kingdom on earth. Far be it from us to entertain the idea that the sacred writer was a wilful deceiver. But it is not inconsistent with apostleship to believe, that he and the early disciples supposed the time of their Lord's return at hand. Paul's language in the first epistle to the Corinthians shows that he expected to be then alive. It was not till after the apostles, that Christians generally began to interpret the coming of the Lord spiritually; and that had an unfavourable influence on their judgment of the Revelation. Millennarians there still were who threw the predicted advent into the future; but the higher prevailed over the carnal view. Primitive Christianity was developed by the spiritual consciousness of the Church; and this development appears at its best stage in the fourth gospel, the genius of which is adverse to a second advent.

The predictions of the book have been unfulfilled,

neither is it likely that most of them await accomplishment in the future. One thing is prominently expressed, the hope of the universal triumph of the Christian church, which may be accepted as a well-founded idea destined to be realised. But unfulfilled predictions need not be a stumbling-block to the reader, since they are not absent from other portions of the New Testament, as well as from the Old. As the pictures and ideas of the book proceed for the most part from the author's imagination, no objective things will put the element of foreknowledge into them. It is vain therefore to look for secular history in the Revelation. It contains neither a syllabus of the world's progress nor of the Roman empire. Neither is it a history of the Church itself; a great event soon to happen is portrayed. The author's horizon is dim and limited. His glances at the immediate past are brief; he does not dwell upon the present, but has respect to the near future where a mighty phenomenon filled the sphere of his vision—the coming of the Lord Jesus, inaugurated by judgments and catastrophes connected with the downfall of paganism.

These remarks are sustained by the prologue and epilogue. 'Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy; for the time is at hand.' 'The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass.' 'He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus.'

### GENERAL STRUCTURE.

The work is disposed on a symmetrical but artificial plan, a knowledge of which is the safest guide to a right perception of the vision-drapery. *Seven* is the leading number throughout. There are seven spirits before the

Father's throne, seven epistles to seven churches, seven stars, seven candlesticks, seven seals, seven eyes, seven horns, seven angels, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven heads on the beast, seven thunders. Subdivisions of this number are three and four. The phases of the future are three,—seals, trumpets, and vials. The first four scenes in each of these are closely connected, being separated from the following by a concluding figure. The seventh trumpet brings the description of three enemies, the dragon, the beast with seven heads and ten horns, and another beast. The number seven is also subdivided into three and a half; or a time, times, and half a time (xii. 14). Thus some numbers play an important part in the arrangement and determine the general method of the work. The interpreter must carefully distinguish between the normal and the subordinate. Stuart has made too much of this principle of *numerosity* as he terms it, without a proper discernment of the numbers. Instead of making *three* the most conspicuous in the author's plan, he should have made *seven*. *Three* and *four* are less prominent, being parts of seven. Ten and twelve do not belong to the general disposition. Zullig is right in assigning the cardinal number,[1] and his American accuser wrong.

### ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The apocalyptic picture consists of visions like those of Daniel. The descriptions, colours, symbols, figures, are taken from the Old Testament prophets, especially Zechariah, Ezekiel, and the author of Daniel's book. Fourth Esdras and the book of Enoch also supplied ideas. John lived in the Old Testament prophecies of a Messianic future. His originality lies in the combination of scattered views and the artificial construction of his book, out of which a patent unity rises. He

[1] *Die Offenbarung Johannis vollständig erklärt*, Einleitung, p. 120, *et seq.*

revises existing apocalyptic elements, expands the great Hebrew theocratic conception, adapting it to the progress of events, and forms all his materials, borrowed or otherwise, into a majestic whole vitalised by the breath of a fiery genius.

The future is said to be written in a book with seven seals, which Christ alone could open; and the seer is permitted to have a view of its contents. As the seals are successively broken, calamities befall the righteous, putting their fidelity to the test. After the sixth, the believing people are themselves sealed with the name of God, for security against subsequent danger. When the seventh is opened, seven angels with trumpets appear, announcing one after another various punishments on the evil world. The seventh trumpet is followed by a description of the hellish powers that oppose Messiah, with the announcement of their destruction. This is succeeded by the final catastrophe, or the outpouring of the vials of divine wrath, and the decisive battle. Rome falls by the returning antichristian emperor, who falls in his turn before the Messiah; the devil is chained for a thousand years, at the end of which he is let loose and besieges the holy city, but is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. Then come the resurrection, the general judgment, and eternal blessedness in the new Jerusalem. The seals, trumpets, and vials, are successive phases in the development of the great drama. Though parallel in some respects, they increase in intensity as they near the final catastrophe.

We need scarcely say that the Messianic hopes of the seer were not fulfilled as his fancy projected them, though he did not utter them as mere poetry without belief in their realisation. The Jews in Jerusalem were not separated and purified, as John anticipated. All were destroyed, with the holy sanctuary and the city itself. Antichrist did not return from the East in the

person of Nero, to devour and lay waste. Paganism indeed fell and Christianity triumphed; but not so soon as represented, nor in that fashion. The first and second resurrections, with their associated events, did not happen. Nor did Christ come personally, destroying opposing powers in order to set up his everlasting kingdom. Yet He came again by his spirit. His religion conquered heathenism. Imperial Rome fell. The non-fulfilment of the seer's hopes in one direction arose from the fact that they were essentially Jewish Christian. Had they been of the purely evangelical type, they would have presented a different aspect. Without objective sensuousness or close imitations of Daniel's visions, they would have grasped the living power of religion as Jesus preached it when He was on earth, accompanied with the Spirit's operation on the hearts and lives of men. Above all, the universal love of God, that great motive power which regenerates mankind, would have filled John's soul. But in spite of the Judaic Christianity that runs through the book, and the forms which its descriptions borrow from surrounding circumstances, a few great ideas lie at the foundation. Stripping off the temporal and individual characteristics that make up the body of it, we come to the apostle's inner conviction, that evil concentrates itself in new forms; that the power of the world however strong, cannot reach the heart of religion, though it may damage its outworks; and that good alone, trodden to the ground as it may be, shall ultimately triumph.

The work may be divided into three parts, viz. the introduction consisting of i.–iii.; the body, made up of a series of visions, iv.–xxii. 5; and the epilogue, xxii. 6–21.

1. This portion contains an inscription (i. 1–3) and dedication (i. 4–8), with the direct address, and letters to the seven churches of Asia.

2. The body of the work may be divided into two parts: iv.–ix., and x.–xxii. 5.

3. The epilogue contains four pieces, viz. the conclusion of the visions, xxii. 6–9; the close of the prophecy, xxii. 10–17; the seer's final remarks, xxii. 18–20; and the end of the epistle, xxii. 21.

As the early Christians believed that Christ would speedily come again, and associated with that event the destruction of his enemies, the prophet paints the overthrow of heathenism identified with the Roman empire. That empire again is symbolised by its head Nero, who had recently fallen by his own hand. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to the Euphrates, whence he should return with a Parthian army, is described here by a Christian poet. The belief in Nero's survival was widespread among heathens and Jews. Dio Chrysostom speaks of it; and the author of the Sibylline oracle v., or at least the Jewish parts of it, mentions him as returning from Parthia to which he had fled. So, too, the author of the fourth Sibylline oracle. The belief was prevalent in the latter half of the first century; and it is difficult to imagine that it arose independently of the Revelation of John. Nero is antichrist; Satanic antichrist opposed to Messiah. This interpretation is at least as old as Commodian (A.D. 270). The Roman power is personified and embodied in Nero, who should reappear in the character of antichrist. The great persecutor of the Christians at that particular crisis was readily identified with antichrist, because he elevated himself against Christ, and his cruelties had struck terror into the pious. Thus the Apocalypse exhibits the triumph of Christianity over paganism, which is tantamount to its *universal* victory. There is a gradual preparation for the catastrophe which ushers in the triumph. Dramatic scenes precede the consummation; and the reader is led on, step by step, to the final issue.

Chapters iv.–vi. refer to the book having seven seals which none but the Lamb could open. These seals are the signs of approaching judgment. After the seventh seal, the sounding of seven trumpets takes place, heralding the advance of the judgment (vii.–ix.).

The 10th chapter is a formal introduction to the following division or the second part (xii.–xxii.). The sounding of the seventh angel-trumpet is naturally expected, for with it the judgment really begins ; yet there is another delay instead. The scene shifts from heaven to earth. A mighty angel descends from heaven, terrifying all with the thunder of his voice (x. 1, &c.). The 11th chapter forms an episode. Before the seventh trumpet, Jerusalem is warned, and exhorted to repent in time. Moses and Elias, significant of the law and prophets, testify in blood as witnesses of the Lamb. The next vision describes the enemy of the Church, or the incipient execution of the judgment (xii.–xiii.), which is succeeded by the vision of the seven vials, that is, the wrathful judgment itself (xiv.–xvi.) issuing in the fall of Babylon, or the final overthrow of heathenism (xvii.–xix.). The last vision relates to the New Jerusalem, the consummation and sequel of the judgment (xx.–xxii.).

The first four seals are distinguished from the last three. The fifth checks the ardent hopes of the Christians, and puts back the time of the end for a little; forming an episode in which the souls of martyrs cry for vengeance on their heathen persecutors. After the sixth is opened, it appears that men have not long to wait, since the heathen rulers and magistrates flee from impending retribution. Even then, however, dominion is not given to the saints. The scene shifts, and a new vision is interposed. Angels seal the people of God. At the opening of the seventh seal, the end is still deferred. There is a short period of breathless expectation. The import of the last seal is unfolded by means

of the seven trumpets and seven vials, each bringing the final catastrophe nearer and nearer. This repeated postponement of the end shows the deep feeling of the prophet and serves to keep expectation alive.

A brief survey of some phenomena will throw light on the meaning of the book.

1. It is difficult to discover a connection between the 11th and 12th chapters. The 10th forms a transition to the second part of the work, and the 11th intervenes. The little book mentioned in x. 1, is the same as the book in v. 1. It is a *little* book, because its contents are concentrated in a focus. What had hitherto been *idea* and *vision* to the prophet, now becomes historical and actual. The scene shifts from heaven to earth. Hence the seer says in xii. 18 (xiii. 1), 'I stood upon the sand of the sea;'[1] whereas he had been taken up to heaven at the commencement of the first part (iv. 1). The preparations for the impending event take place in heaven. When it is on the eve of accomplishment, earth is the theatre.

2. The beast with seven heads and ten horns rising up out of the sea symbolises the Roman power. The seven heads are identical with the seven kings or emperors; and the ten horns are the ten proconsuls, imperial vicegerents in the thirty provinces. The head, slain as it were, yet having its deadly wound healed, represents Nero. The dragon which gave power to the beast is Satan (xiii. 4). The same beast is depicted in xvii. 3 as scarlet-coloured, full of names of blasphemy. The woman on the beast is the great city Babylon or Rome, the metropolis of spiritual harlotry. The second beast, or the false prophet who helps the first beast, is a personification of heathen prophecy, including magic, astrology, auguries, omens, &c., supporting the idolatrous paganism concentrated in Roman imperalism. It

[1] ἐστάθην as Tischendorf rightly reads; not ἐστάθη, which Lachmann has.

is improbable to refer the false prophet to the Emperor Vespasian as Hildebrandt does; and all but absurd to identify him with Paul, because the apostle recommends every soul to be subject to the reigning sovereign Nero, in the epistle to the Romans (xiii. 1, &c.). Yet Volkmar puts forth the conjecture.

3. The number of the beast is said to be the number of a man, 666 (xiii. 18). This is made up of the numeral letters in *Cæsar Nero.*[1] A shorter form of *Nero*[2] would make 616, which is a very ancient reading for 666, as we learn from Irenæus. Objection has been made to this explanation, that the author writes in Greek not Hebrew; but his style of thought is Hebrew.

4. After the fourth angel sounds his trumpet, a threefold woe is announced in viii. 13. In ix. 12 it is said that the first woe, corresponding to the fifth trumpet sound, is past and that two more are to come. In xi. 14 the second woe is past, 'and behold the third woe cometh quickly.' Yet the third woe is not mentioned afterwards. When or where did it come? Hengstenberg affirms, that the third woe and seventh trumpet-sound are in xi. 15–19; and explains the point arbitrarily. With Baur,[3] we find the third woe in xvi. 15, 'Behold I come as a thief.' The Lord's sudden coming is identical with it.

5. Some have thought that the 11th chapter describes a catastrophe befalling Jerusalem, similar to that which afterwards happened to Rome. In this view, the fall of Judaism and the fall of heathenism are leading phenomena in the book. Accordingly Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and others suppose the general theme to be Christianity triumphing over Judaism as well as paganism. This is incorrect. What happens to Jerusalem is not a final catastrophe or total destruction, but a partial

[1] ק=100, ם=60, ר=200; נ=50, ר=200, ו=6, נ=50, i.e. קסר נרון, making 666.

[2] נרו instead of נרון.

[3] *Theologische Jahrbücher von Baur und Zeller*, xi. p. 441, *et seq.*

judgment or purifying process, which is only a subordinate scene in the drama of preparatory phenomena. Jerusalem is not destroyed but preserved. The theocratic seed is spared. Believing Judaism is still an object of the divine favour. The author, himself a Jew, with patriotic feelings which Christianity did not quench, supposes that the city and outer court of the temple should be trodden down by the heathen for three years and a half, a number taken down from Daniel; but that the temple itself should be spared, with the worshippers in it, during that period. James the Just was there, and other Jewish Christians, praying for the salvation of the nation. This is very different from the fate of Rome, the persecuting and implacable enemy of the Christians, doomed to total destruction. Jerusalem should only suffer in part and for a season. The holy city should be spared, and the faithful inhabitants protected by Jehovah, while the unbelieving Jews should be destroyed. A comparatively small portion of the city falls (the tenth), and only seven thousand of the inhabitants; the majority being saved by penitence. If the issue did not correspond to the hopes of the prophet we need not be surprised. Inspiration did not enable him to predict definite events, though his sympathies were right and true. The chapter should not be resolved into mere symbol, as it is by Eichhorn and Stuart.

6. The millennium, or thousand years' reign of the saints, has given rise to much discussion. Among the New Testament writers, it is peculiar to the apocalyptist; though many Rabbins held it, as Gfrörer has shown.[1] The common view of the early Christians was, that the righteous and wicked should rise, with a short time intervening, and be judged by Christ, John separates the two resurrections by a long interval. The so-called *first* resurrection, including Jews only, is in Daniel xii. 2, &c.; the separation of the two by a thousand years

[1] *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. p. 198, *et seq.*, 210.

is peculiar to the Apocalypse writer. There is no trace of millennarianism in the fourth gospel, where Christ's judgment and condemnation appear to be taken spiritually. The chaining and loosing of Satan during the period and at the end of it respectively, together with the attack of the heathen powers on the followers of the Lamb, are also unique. Such ideas do not agree well with Christ's discourse in the 24th chapter of the first gospel; nor are they in harmony with Paul's sentiments (1 Cor. xv. 23–28; 1 Thess. iv. 15–17). In Paul's doctrine no definite duration is assigned to the period between the appearing of Christ with the first resurrection which is that of Christians, and the end with the resurrection of all, when He gives up the sovereignty to God. The time of Christ's visible government of the world until the end of all things is left indeterminate; and it is characterised by unceasing war against hostile powers, and the conquering of them; while the Apocalyptist regards it as the reign of undisturbed blessedness during which Christ and his saints are visibly united; Satan being bound and powerless. The two writers agree in supposing an interval between the second advent and the end of the world, in other words between the first and second resurrections; they differ not merely in Paul's silence as to the duration of that interval, but in the way Christ exercises his sovereignty. The Pauline idea is that foes will war and be overcome; the Apocalyptic, that there will be nothing but uninterrupted happiness. In giving expression to hopes and aspirations, the seer paints a subjective state for which no objective correspondence in the future should be looked for. That it is merely ideal, is apparent from certain incongruities, such as the risen saints having their camp beside the earthly Jerusalem, and being attacked by heathen nations; as well as from the existence of heathen enemies, after all the inhabitants of the earth are slain (xix. 21).

A millennium was not unknown to the Jewish Christians, to whom it came from the later Jews, who had speculated about the age of the world and its seven thousand years' duration. The combination of Psalm xc. 4 with the seven days of creation led to the inference of *seven* thousand. It was natural to look for a happy period among the seven; and some fixed upon the last. Thus the millennium of John is an offspring of the later Judaism.[1]

7. As to the period described in the last two chapters, that of the new heavens and new earth, most interpreters take it to be what is commonly called *heaven*; while some, as Hammond, Hug, and Bush, think it alludes to a flourishing state of the Church on earth. These views are substantially one, since the renewed earth with the happiness of the saints upon it coincides with heaven in the writer's imagination. The ideas and imagery are taken from Isai. liv. 11, 12; lx. 3, 11; lxv. 17–20; lxvi. 22. The future renovation of the earth was a prevailing notion among the Jews, after their captivity in Babylon. In this case John drew from the Deutero-Isaiah and his own imagination. His ideal hopes are, that heaven and earth should become one in the future kingdom of Messiah. Heaven descends to earth, and earth becomes heaven. The holy Church in her triumphant state is the fulfilment of all that was associated with ancient Jerusalem in the Hebrew heart. She is depicted as God's dwelling-place, the sacred city, new Jerusalem, the chaste spouse of Christ, the Lamb's wife. This is the ultimate aim of all apocalyptic prophecy, the completion of the mystery of God. The picture which is mainly ideal, embodies the writer's conceptions of the consummation of the Christian Church, or in other words, the everlasting

[1] See Tanchuma, fol. 255. 1; Gemara Aboda Sara I. p. 65, ed. Edz. Sanhedrin, fol. 97. 2, 92. 1; Pesikta in Yalkut Shimoni II. fol. 56, c. 3, n. 359; Eisenmenger's *Entdeckt. Jud.* tom. II. pp. 652, 678, etc.

happiness of the righteous. To attempt to find particulars corresponding to the figures employed would be to convert poetry into prose. The ideas of the seer should be left indefinite, else their beauty vanishes. No mystic meaning lies in the details of his picture. Elements expressive of magnificence and splendour are combined to give rhetorical beauty to the composition. A new Jerusalem symbolises a state of pure happiness ; since Jewish ideas of earthly greatness and excellence were centred in the beloved city. A Jewish Christian such as John, cannot separate the glorious future of earth and heaven from the loved metropolis of his sires.

8. The Apocalypse keeps to the Jewish Christian standpoint throughout. Jews and Gentiles are not merged in a common description of the saved ; they are distinguished from one another, and the latter usually appear outside the Messianic kingdom. Even in the millennium, they are separate from the Judaic Christians ; and when the kingdom of God is completed, they are external (xx. 8 ; xxi. 24 ; xxii. 2). This is un-Pauline. Hilgenfeld also remarks that the author's Jewish Christianism is coloured with Essenism, because the court that is without the temple (xi. 2) containing the altar of burnt offering is consigned to destruction ; and the Essenes refrained from bloody sacrifices. The elect saints are also termed virgins not defiled with women (xiv. 4) ; and the Essenes attached great virtue to celibacy. The apostle himself was unmarried, according to ancient tradition.

## CANONICITY AND VALUE.

It is usually thought that the question of authorship affects canonicity and value. Yet the book may not have proceeded from an apostle and be equal in worth to any apostolic production. It is not of essen-

tial moment that the Revelation should be written by a son of Zebedee. Value does not depend on canonicity but contents. Degrees of excellence attach to the canonical writings. We are far from denying that authorship is of consequence; but it is not of the highest. The man who composed the fourth gospel, and John the apostle, would necessarily write differently, because their mental development was unequal. Though inspired, their ideas and the mode of expressing them might still differ. Apostles themselves were not equally gifted. The Apocalypse is not of the same authority as if it had been written by Paul. Its Judaic texture, the story respecting Nero coming back from the East with a Parthian army after he had taken away his own life, and the part which that emperor occupies in the apocalyptic prophecy generally, do not consist with Pauline sentiments. The inquirer feels that the more he examines the stronger is his belief that the book breathes another spirit than that of the fourth gospel, and disagrees with the Church's destination. The proper evangelical sentiment which we see in Matt. xxiv. 14, Rom. xi. 25, is in the background; and the general tone clashes with Mark xiii. 32. The book has a lower standpoint than the Pauline epistles or the fourth gospel. Yet it has exerted a great spiritual influence upon mankind. A certain moral expression running through its symbolical descriptions tells with much power upon the susceptible Christian. In moving and strengthening the soul, in bearing it upward to the throne of God amid suffering, sorrow, and persecution, in attracting its sympathies towards the faithful followers of the Lamb, and in exciting aspirations which can only be realised in the new Jerusalem so gorgeously painted at the close, its prophetic utterances have a singular value. The general strain is elevating. Alluring promises console the righteous; awful warnings deter them from unfaithfulness to their vocation; the Almighty's vengeance

appals the wicked. The grandeur of the book urges the spirit forward in the difficult path of duty, with the hope of a glorious crown, a golden harp, celestial fruits, refreshing waters of the river of life; the hope of living and reigning with Christ in perpetual blessedness. The lower place which the work occupies in sketching early Christianity is not seen till its various contents are examined.

### SCHEMES OF INTERPRETATION.

Schemes of interpretation, *preterist*, *continuous*, and *future*, adopted by different commentators must be rejected, except the first. Expositors of the continuous and futurist class fall into the fatal error of converting apocalyptic poetry into historical prose, and of making all symbols significant. Nor are preterists free from blame. In applying their principle of interpretation they are sure to err, if they try to show that all was fulfilled in the immediate future; or that the seer was infallibly guided in his prognostications and hopes. The apostle's standpoint should be correctly estimated. The mode in which the old prophets depicted the future should be known, not as if they were able to predict definite events succeeding one another, but as they saw dimly the things to which their enraptured spirits were carried forward, and painted them in ideal colours. Their own sentiments, hopes, desires, and fears, are elements in the pictures they draw—pictures whose general outline alone should be considered *real* to them —though it may not be so to us.

### ERRORS INTO WHICH EXPOSITORS HAVE FALLEN.

To enumerate all the mistakes committed by interpreters would be impossible. We can only glance at a few.

1. If the historic basis be abandoned, imagination

has ample range for extravagance. The author did not forego time and place; elements that cannot safely be neglected. He states that the things must *shortly* come to pass, and that the time is *at hand*. These expressions are significant as to the period of the visions. The advent of Christ is announced to take place within a short time. One city is the theatre of sublime and terrible occurrences, Babylon built on seven hills,—Rome, the representative of heathenism or antichristian idolatry. The judgment culminates in the catastrophe of Rome's downfall which is succeeded by the new Jerusalem. Historic personages of John's time appear. Seven Roman emperors are alluded to; one in particular. Unless the expositor adhere to the historic present and immediate future of the seer, he will lose himself in endless conjecture. Jewish ideas of Messiah's advent should be known as well as Jewish Christian ones. The prophet stands in the historical circumstances of his own time, and describes the second advent in a series of dramatic visions.

2. It is a fundamental mistake to look for a detailed history of the Church, or of leading events in the world's history that affect Christianity. Some find an epitome of the Church's history even in the epistles to the seven churches. Others find it in the remainder of the book; others, in both together. Accordingly particular events are assigned to particular periods; persons are specified, peoples characterised, and definite names assigned. In this fashion the vicissitudes through which the Christian religion has passed in the world are supposed to be sketched. The allegorising process by which such interpretation is supported, cannot be repudiated too strongly. Though it has had able advocates, Vitringa, Mede, Faber, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Auberlen, and Hofmann, it is inconsistent with the scope of the Apocalypse and the analogy of prophecy.

3. We should not look for a circumstance, event,

person, or nation corresponding to the images of the seer. 'All the particular traits in this large work,' says Hug, 'are by no means significant. Many are introduced only to enliven the representation, or are taken from the prophets and sacred books for the purpose of ornament; and no one who has any judgment in such matters, will deny that the work is extraordinarily rich and gorgeous for a production of Western origin.'[1] This plain principle has been systematically violated by most English commentators. Thus one of them, in explaining the language descriptive of the effect of the fifth angel-trumpet (ix. 1, &c.), pronounces the star fallen from heaven, Mohammed. The secret cave of Hera near Mecca, is the pit of the abyss whence the pestilential fumes and darkness issued. The key of the abyss was given him in contrast to the key of God in the Koran. The locusts to which the Saracens are compared are peculiarly Arabic, since the very name of the one suggests the other, both being similar in pronunciation and radicals![2] If the absurdity of this method needs exposure, the reader has only to look farther at the hypotheses respecting the two witnesses in the 11th chapter, which Ebrard reviving an old view refers to the *law* and the *gospel*; and another has assumed to be the Son and Spirit of God; whereas the whole description shows them to be Moses and Elias. In like manner, the fourth vial being referred to the wars of the French revolution, the words 'power was given him to scorch men with fire' (xvi. 8) allude to Napoleon, who employed artillery to an unprecedented extent, and inflicted fiery suffering both on his own nation and others. The men thus scorched 'blasphemed the name of God who had power over these plagues, and repented not to give him glory' (xvi. 9), meaning that the suffering nations during that fearful period (1789–1809) did not renounce the papal apo-

[1] Fosdick's translation, p. 668.

[2] אַרְבֶּה and עֵרְבִי!

stasy for a purer faith! Another expositor says, that the woman in the 12th chapter 'represents the covenant of redemption; and the child to be brought forth, the righteousness provided by the covenant; that is, the destined means of counteracting the power of the legal accuser or avenger—the means of delivering the sinner from a yoke even worse than that of Egyptian bondage.'

4. The principle of synchronism has been largely adopted by interpreters since the days of Mede and Vitringa; an explanation and defence of it being given in the *clavis apocalyptica* (apocalyptic key) of the former. A scheme so ingenious has been followed by the majority of English expositors. The same events, it is said, are represented by a succession of symbols, the symbols being varied while the things signified are the same. Instead of the book being continuously progressive, it is progressive and retrogressive throughout.

The principle in question is connected with that interpretation which finds an historical epitome in the book, and stands or falls with it. The series of visions is progressive; but, as the events which the seer depicts are the same, the progression is prophetic. It is not a description of successive events, but an ideal picture with dramatic unfolding.

5. As to the designations of time, those who take a day for a year cannot establish the truth of their opinion. In prophecy, a day means a day as elsewhere, unless the time be indefinite; as has been proved by Maitland and Stuart. But most numbers in the Revelation should be taken indefinitely, because they are part of a poetic costume borrowed from the Old Testament.

6. The peculiar exegesis which refers the book to heretics and sectaries, began in the thirteenth century; and it was the Romish church which set the example of it. Innocent III., in rousing up the Crusade, said

that the Saracens were the true antichrist, Mohammed the false prophet, and 666 years the duration of his power. As the church of Rome grew more corrupt, its opponents turned the descriptions of the book against it. The pope was identified with antichrist ; and Rome papal with the great whore of Babylon.[1] Since the Reformation, Protestants have generally found the papacy and its destruction, in the book. Antipapal exegesis has as much foundation as Rome's antiheretic one. Signor Pastorini applies the sounding of the fifth trumpet (ix. 1–11) to Luther, who renouncing his faith and vows, may be said to have fallen. When he opened the door of hell, there issued forth a thick smoke, or a strong spirit of seduction which had been hatched in hell.[2] A Protestant parallel to this absurd exposition applies the beast in chapters xiii., xvii. to the succession of popes.

[1] See Lücke, *Einleitung*, pp. 1005, 1006, 2nd ed.

[2] *The General History of the Christian Church, chiefly deduced from the Apocalypse of St. John*, p. 170, *et seq.* 5th ed. 1812.

# THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

A SERIES of epistles, distinct from Paul's, are called *catholic*. They form a peculiar collection, and are seven in number, the alleged writings of James, Peter, John, and Jude. The origin of the appellation *catholic* is not clear.

An examination of patristic testimony respecting it leads to the following results:—

1. The term *catholic* meant no more at first than *intended for a wide circle of readers*. Its application to New Testament writings was early made by Papias and Polycarp to the first epistles of John and Peter; distinguishing them from Paul's, which were commonly addressed to churches or individuals. Thus Clement of Alexandria speaks of the epistle of the apostles to the church at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22–29) as a *catholic epistle*.[1] Apollonius relates of a Montanist called Themison, that he composed a *catholic* epistle in imitation of the apostle (probably John).[2] Origen speaks of the epistle of Barnabas as a *catholic* epistle.[3] He also refers to Peter's *catholic* epistle, and repeatedly applies the same epithet to the first epistle of John. The epistle of Jude he designates in the same way, but only in passages where the Latin translation alone exists. Dionysius of Alexandria applies the same word to John's first epistle.[4]

2. It was probably in the last half of the third

[1] *Stromata*, iv. 15, p. 606, ed. Potter.
[2] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18.
[3] *Contra Celsum*, i. 63.
[4] Ap. Euseb. vii. 25.

century that the epistles of Jude and James, the second of Peter, with the second and third of John, were added to the other three, forming with them one collection called *catholic*, because they were publicly read in the catholic Christian church. Eusebius does not use *catholic* as synonymous with *canonical* or *apostolic*, any more than his predecessors.[1]

After the time of Eusebius, when the seven were incorporated into the canon and put by the side of the Pauline collection, the appellation was gradually identified with *canonical* or *apostolic*, sooner in the Latin church than the Greek. Hence Junilius speaks of the seven as canonical, meaning *apostolic*,[2] and Cassiodorus follows him.[3] Thus the error became rooted in the Latin church that the catholic epistles are canonical or apostolic. Some think that they find a trace of *catholic* becoming equivalent to *canonical* in the Muratorian fragment, but the text is too uncertain to warrant that conclusion.[4]

In the majority of ancient MSS. the catholic epistles follow the Acts of the Apostles, and precede those of Paul. Lachmann and Tischendorf arrange them so in their editions of the Greek Testament. The Sinaitic MS. has them immediately before the Revelation, which is the usual position. The first epistles of John and Peter obtained general recognition sooner than the rest. Papias had already received them. The letters of James and Jude, which were considered unapostolic at first and therefore uncanonical, were afterwards put with the others; while the second and third of John formed an appendix to the rest. When the second of Peter was adopted, it could only be placed after the first, though its alleged authorship was doubted much longer than any of the seven, and has always raised suspicions.

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 3. [2] *De Partibus Legis Divinæ*, i. 6.

[3] *De Institutione Divinarum Scripturarum*, c. 8.

[4] 'Epistola sane Judæ et superscriptio Johannis duas in catholica habentur. To *catholica, ecclesia* may be supplied. Bunsen corrects it into *catholicis*.

# THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

## THE JAMESES.

THREE PERSONS bearing the name of James are mentioned in the New Testament.

*First.* James the son of Zebedee and brother of John, who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa as related in the Acts, about A.D. 44. He is commonly styled *the greater* or *elder*.

*Secondly.* James the son of Alpheus is mentioned (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13). Mark says that his mother's name was Mary (xv. 40), which Mary is said to be the wife of Cleophas in John xix. 25. Cleophas and Alpheus are probably identical; the former a Hebraising, the latter a Greek form of the same word. This James is usually styled *the less*, either because he was younger than the other, or less in stature.

*Thirdly.* Another James is spoken of as *the Lord's brother* (Gal. i. 19; Josephus's Antiqq. xx. ch. ix. 1). The same is meant in 1 Cor. xv. 7.

Some identify the last two, arguing that a narrative in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as quoted by Jerome, represents James the Just, the Lord's brother, as present at the breaking of bread, after the resurrection; that the superscription of the old apocryphal Gospel of James assumes the same view; that Papias, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret held their identity; that only two of the name

appear in the Acts; that the James who occupies a prominent place in Jerusalem after the death of Zebedee's son, is not distinguished from the son of Alpheus; that he is not specified as one of the Lord's brethren in Acts i. 14; but on the contrary is reckoned among the apostles in Gal. i. 19, according to the most natural explanation of the passage. These and other considerations which have been urged, are not conclusive. They are weakened by the fact, that the identification of the two Jameses is usually accompanied by the belief that James was son of Mary, sister of Mary the mother of Jesus and wife of Cleophas, which is founded on John xix. 25, where Mary, wife of Cleophas, is apparently called a sister of the Virgin Mary. Perhaps, however, the construction does not require this. If four females instead of three are spoken of in the passage, the difficulty of two sisters having the same name is removed; and the sister of Jesus's mother is Salome, mother of Zebedee's children. In any case, the Greek word translated *brother*, should not be taken for *cousin* or *relative* (Gal. i. 19), as it is by those who identify James the Lord's brother with the son of Alpheus.

Notwithstanding all that is urged by Lange[1] in favour of the two Jameses being identical, it is more probable that they were different persons. The *earliest* ecclesiastical writers separated them, commencing with Hegesippus, a native of Palestine. Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Clementines, and the majority of the fathers, held them to be different. In no catalogue of the apostles does James the son of Alpheus appear as the Lord's brother. It is true that we read in Gal. i. 19, 'other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother,' words which *appear* to put James the Lord's brother among the apostles, and so to identify him with the son of Alpheus; but this interpretation is not necessary, for the meaning may be,

[1] In *Herzog's Encyklopädie.*

'another of the apostles I did not see, except that, in addition to Peter, I saw James.'[1] This version is possible, as Winer, Fritzsche, and others admit.

Adopting, as we do, the diversity of the two Jameses in question, the Lord's brother was either full brother or half-brother to Jesus, for—

(*a.*) Such is the primary and natural signification of the Greek word rendered *brother*, corroborated by its usage in Josephus. No example of its extended application to *cousin* or *relative* can be found in the New Testament. Appeal has been made to Matt. i. 11, where the term is said to mean *uncle* ; but that is doubtful. Nor can the fathers be quoted for examples of the wider sense, since it is very questionable whether the passages in Eusebius,[2] to which Kern and others refer, and one from Hegesippus in the same historian,[3] prove the extended use of the term. A wide sense like that of the corresponding Hebrew word is possible, but it is without precedent in the New Testament.

(*b.*) The *brethren* of Jesus appear in close connection with his mother (Matt. xiii. 55 ; Mark vi. 3 ; John ii. 12), so that it is natural to consider them her sons.

(*c.*) These brothers did not believe on him (John vii. 5), at a time when James son of Alpheus had been chosen an apostle.

(*d.*) In Acts i. 14 ; 1 Cor. ix. 5, the *brethren* are distinguished from the apostles.

We believe, therefore, that the brethren of the Lord, James, Joses (Joseph), Simon, Judas, were Jesus's brothers, and that none of them was in the list of apostles. They were not sons of Alpheus, consequently James the Lord's brother is a different person from James son of Alpheus. In what sense were the four, brothers of Jesus ? The account given by Epiphanius and Theophylact is, that Cleophas and Joseph were

[1] εἰ μὴ qualifies the whole sentence and not merely the word ἀποστόλων.
[2] *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 4 ; iv. 5. [3] *Ibid.* iv. 22.

brothers. The former dying without issue, Joseph married his brother's widow and had children, agreeably to the Levitical law. James, the first-born, was hence called the son of Cleophas. This is improbable. Many have thought that the four were Joseph's sons by a former wife, an opinion drawn from apocryphal gospels, according to Jerome. It is most likely that the four brethren of Jesus were born after him, being the sons of Joseph and Mary. This agrees with the epithet *first-born* applied to Jesus in Luke ii. 7. If he was the first-born, Mary must have had other children.

It has been objected, that our Lord, before expiring on the cross, committed his mother to the care of John the son of Zebedee. Had James been her son or even her stepson, it is alleged that Jesus would not have transferred the charge of his mother to one who did not sustain that relation. This argument derives its value from the implied assumption that the brethren had become believers at the time ; if they continued to reject his Messiahship, it is not probable that she would have been entrusted to the care of any of them. Besides, the statement is hardly historical.

. There are various allusions to James the Lord's brother in the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's epistles (xii. 17 ; xv. 13 ; xxi. 18, &c. ; Gal. i. 19 ; ii. 9, 12 ; 1 Cor. xv. 7). He occupied a high official station in the church of Jerusalem, being bishop there according to tradition. Whether his influence was due to age, personal character, or official position, it is impossible to determine. After the death of Festus the procurator, he suffered martyrdom in a tumult at the temple, as told by Josephus and Eusebius. The exact circumstances of his death cannot be ascertained, though Eusebius occupies with them a large part of one chapter in his history, quoting Hegesippus, Clement, and Josephus. His narrative has been suspected of falsification by Christian hands, perhaps without reason. Hegesippus's

has fabulous materials, and does not agree well with Josephus's as to the time of James's martyrdom; though Hilgenfeld tries to make them concordant. One thing is well attested, viz. that James was stoned by the Jews in A.D. 62, according to Josephus, who places his death in the interval between the decease of the procurator Porcius Festus and the arrival of his successor Albinus. Hegesippus's account as given by Eusebius is repeated by Jerome, Epiphanius, and Abdias. Augustine concurs. James was styled the *just* for his eminent virtue and ascetic life.

Mistakes were made at an early period about James the Lord's brother. He was confounded with James the Greater by Irenæus; and with James the Less by Clement of Alexandria. But the Apostolic Constitutions separate him from the apostles. In modern times, Wieseler,[1] adopting the opinion of Clement, has laboured to show that James the son of Alpheus, not James the Lord's brother, was the head of the Jerusalem church. It is thought that *an apostle* should occupy a prominent position in ecclesiastical matters, instead of being ignored in the Acts. Tradition is against this opinion. If an apostle be wanted for the head of the church at Jerusalem, James the Less and James the Lord's brother should be identified. Those who separate them, as Wieseler does, and still make the former the prominent one in the Acts, are obliged to distinguish the James of Gal. i. 19 from him of Gal. ii. 9–12.[2] We believe that *three* Jameses are spoken of in the New Testament; not two, as those who identify the younger apostle with the Lord's brother suppose. And it is improbable that the persons called Jesus's *brethren* were so from Joseph's *first* marriage, so that Mary was not their mother.[3]

[1] In the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1842.

[2] See Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 544.

[3] See Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1880, p. 198, etc.

Various suppositious productions bear the name of James (the Lord's brother), such as the *Protevangelium Jacobi*; the *Diamartyria* appended to the first introductory letter in the Clementine Homilies; and the *Anabathmoi*. These are Ebionite productions.

### AUTHORSHIP.

James the Elder died too early to allow of the supposition that he wrote the epistle. Yet the subscription of the old Latin version published by Martianay and Sabatier (ff) assigns it to him. The subscriptions of the Peshito in the editions of Widmansted, Tremellius, and Trost, probably ascribe it to James the Less, though they have no more than the *apostle* James. It must either have been written by, or in the name of, James the Lord's brother, or James son of Alpheus. Most of the early fathers attribute it to the former; but internal evidence must decide.

1. The acquaintance which the epistle shows with Paul's epistles, especially those to the Romans and Galatians; above all its polemic aspect towards the doctrine of justification by faith alone, assign it to a somewhat late period.

2. The style of writing is too good for James, being pure, elevated, poetical, betraying the influence of Grecian culture. We do not deny that he knew Greek, though he lived constantly at Jerusalem; indeed a passage in Hegesippus, where it is related that the Jews wished James to address the people at the passover, 'because all the tribes have come together, on account of the passover, with the Gentiles also,' implies his acquaintance with that language.[1] But all we know of him, makes it improbable that he could write *such* Greek as that of the epistle. The diction is remarkable for its vivid colouring, its felicitous selection of terms, its rhe-

[1] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

torical character; and could scarcely proceed from a Jewish Christian like James, who, presiding over the mother church at Jerusalem, thought and spoke in Aramæan. The good Greek of the epistle is strange, and cannot be explained by the assumption that James had grown up in a district entirely Grecised like Galilee. Its figurative style tells against him; although an abrupt sententiousness is not wanting.

3. As far as we know the character of James from the New Testament and Hegesippus, it is not in harmony with the epistle. He was a narrow, ascetic Jewish Christian who would not have omitted allusion to circumcision and the ceremonial law. Herder indeed tries to show an agreement with the disposition and character of the Lord's brother; but the whole letter harmonises badly with such authorship.

4. The Jewish Christian standpoint of the writer is apparent. He calls Abraham 'our father,' and appeals to the word of truth as the royal *law*, and the perfect *law of* liberty. He uses the word *synagogue* (ii. 2) not *church*; and Epiphanius tells us that the Ebionites did the same. The moral deterioration of Christians is referred in part to the licence of Pauline doctrine which set them free from the law; and the author asserts against it, justification by works. Hilgenfeld has rightly observed, that the legal Christianity advocated by James is coloured with Essene morality. The sentiments respecting swearing, riches, and trade coincide with those of the Essenes. The writer emphasises mercy, exhorts his readers to be swift to hear, slow to speak, and slow to wrath—admonitions which agree with Josephus's description of the sect. The Orphic colouring which Hilgenfeld professes to see also, appealing to the admonition against much speaking and the evil produced by the tongue, to the word of truth (i. 18), the engrafted word (i. 21), and especially to the description of the tongue in iii. 6, is precarious. The

writer's Ebionite point of view accounts for the fact that the essential doctrines of Christianity, such as atonement by the death of Christ, his resurrection, the influence of the Holy Spirit, &c., are absent. It has no christology, though Pfeiffer and Huther are anxious to find one in i. 1; neither are distinctive Christian doctrines implied in iv. 5, and v. 14, as the latter supposes. Had James written it, we should naturally expect some mention of Christ's resurrection. But no distinctive Christian doctrine appears, not even the fact that Jesus approved himself the Messiah by his death and resurrection.

5. If the letter has respect to the doctrine taught by Paul, it can scarcely be James's. It is true that the bishop of Jerusalem was put to death by the Pharisees before Judaism received its death-blow in the destruction of the city; but the tendency of the epistle points to a time when there was some desire to bring the Pauline and Judaising parties nearer to one another.

6. The letter is professedly addressed to all Jewish Christians out of Palestine. But were there churches composed of such members? All were made up of Jewish and Gentile believers; the larger proportion being Gentiles. Churches were of a mixed character, except in Palestine. Wiesinger therefore may well ask, Where shall we look for the Jewish Christians out of Palestine which will satisfy the requirements of the epistle? a question not answered by a reference to Acts ii. 5–11; xi. 19, &c., because the passages are far from implying the extensive establishment of Jewish Christian churches immediately after Pentecost, even if the accounts were literally exact. The earliest history, so far from containing a clear trace of such churches widely scattered through the lands, disproves their multiplication. Does not another writer than James betray himself here, in addressing Jewish Christians alone, whereas they were so incorporated with Gentile

ones in the churches that an epistle could not find them alone? De Wette, however, understands 'the twelve tribes scattered abroad,' to mean all Christians out of Palestine; and thus removes the incongruity. And how did James become acquainted with the state and temptations of the Jewish Christians scattered through many lands and incorporated with many Gentile churches? Were they in the habit of visiting Jerusalem to keep the feasts, so that he could learn in that way? Those in Syria, Cilicia, and the other parts adjacent may have gone up to the metropolis; but this does not apply to the majority scattered through more distant lands. The bishop of the Jerusalem church could have got little definite information from the strangers visiting his city, comparatively few as they were. In any case, the writer does not convey the impression that his knowledge of their condition was minute or specific, for his language is general, such as a later author writing in his name would employ; and his relation to them is never alluded to. The link between them, as far as the epistle shows, is a loose one.

These observations are unfavourable to the composition of the letter by James the Just. And they disagree equally with the authorship of James the Less. The writer does not style himself the *Lord's brother*; neither does he call himself an apostle. Probably the Judaised Christianity of the epistle should not be carried into the second century and the circle of the Clementine Homilies. That there are parallels between these homilies and our epistle, cannot be denied.[1] The origin and object of the apocryphal production lead to points of resemblance. But there are marked differences also. Ingenious therefore as Schwegler's reasoning is,[2] it does not prove that the epistle was written in James's name

[1] A collection of them is given by Kern, *Der Brief Jacobi, u. s. w.*, p. 56, *et seq.*

[2] Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, vol. i. p. 13, *et seq.*

so late as the second century. The production is a post-Pauline one, proceeding from a Jewish Christian or Ebionite.

### PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED.

According to i. 1, the letter is directed to 'the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad,' i.e. to all the Jews out of Palestine; that is, to such as had embraced Christianity, the spiritual Israel in their dispersion. The writer did not intend to address unbelieving Jews or unconverted as well as converted ones, but simply converts. This appears at the commencement, where the words, 'the trying of your faith worketh patience,' imply believers. So also, ii. 1, 'have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons.' The seventh verse of the 2nd chapter points to the same conclusion: 'Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?' i.e. the name of Christ.

It is inconclusive to argue that the letter was intended for the unconverted as well as the converted Jews because there is only a general salutation at the beginning and no Christian benediction at the end. Nor is it correct to interpret the wars and fightings (iv. 1–10) of the mutinies of the Jews, especially the Zealots. Neither was the 3rd chapter intended for Jews, as well as Jewish Christians.

We cannot extend the sense of the expression 'the twelve tribes' so far as to make it equivalent to the 'Israel of God' in Gal. vi. 16, i.e. to all Christians Jewish and Gentile, though the true Israel of God embrace them, because the use of the phrase *twelve tribes* is inexplicable if the writer intended all believers without distinction. The author makes no allusion to Gentile converts, nor to the relation between Jew and Gentile incorporated into one spiritual body.

In answer to the questions, Were Jewish Christians out of Palestine numerous, at the time when the epistle was written? in what country or countries were they? were they scattered through many lands, or confined to a comparatively limited district? no specific information can be given. There is no authority for limiting the circle of readers, as some have done, to Syria, Cilicia, and the adjacent parts. It is also unwarrantable to include among them Jewish Christians in the Palestinian churches out of Jerusalem, as Huther is inclined to do. We abide by the view that the letter was professedly written for the benefit of all Jews out of Palestine who had embraced Christianity.

## PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

Hug[1] has attempted to deduce the place of writing from certain internal marks, which, in his opinion, clearly point to Palestine. The author's native land was not far from the sea (i. 6 ; iii. 4), and was blessed with valuable productions, such as figs, oil, and wine (iii. 12). It was exposed to drought ; and productions were often scarce for want of rain (v. 17, 18). Sudden devastations of the vegetable kingdom were occasioned by a fiery wind (i. 11). The early and latter rains were familiar (v. 7). As these phenomena existed in many oriental countries they do not necessarily point to Palestine. There is great difficulty in ascertaining the *time* of writing, as is evident from the fact that some critics fix it so early as A.D. 44, others so late as the second century, and dates vary between these extremes. The following particulars bear upon this point.

1. The destruction of Jerusalem, with which the early Christians identified Christ's second coming, was approaching (v. 7, 8) or at hand.

[1] Introduction by Fosdick, p. 587.

2. In ii. 7 there is an allusion to the name *Christian*. The disciples were called Christians for the first time at Antioch. This makes the date later than Acts xi. 26, or A.D. 44.

3. In ii. 2–4, distinctions of places or seats in Christian churches, an ambitious love of pre-eminence in the meetings for worship, an unworthy partiality for the rich and a neglect of the poor, are inconsistent with an early period. Such outward arrangements and conveniences in places of worship imply a state of organisation which did not exist for a considerable time after churches were formed; an argument not disproved by the erroneous assumption that the places of meeting for Jewish Christians were then synagogues. The Greek word translated *assembly* (ii. 2) does not mean *the place* of meeting, but the congregation in the place. Nor is it like the freshness and zeal of recent conversion, that rich members should covet outward respect in regard to seats in congregations; or that the poor should be treated with marked disfavour. Piety had greatly degenerated where this spirit appeared. Amid the worldly views and arrangements which prevailed in these Christian assemblies, early Christian love had grown cold. We must therefore assume a time sufficient to allow of the existence of conveniences in buildings used for worship, of seats comfortable and otherwise, of a spirit of partiality and ambitious selfishness on the part of the rich. Though human nature is prone to deteriorate, the Jewish converts could scarcely have fallen so far from their first love soon after their adoption of Christianity. Years would be required for such declension. Should it be said that the deterioration is accounted for by the time between Peter's sermon at Pentecost and the date of the epistle, the plea is insufficient, because *all* the Jewish Christians out of Palestine are addressed; and a declension so universal is improbable. Had one or more churches degenerated, the assumption might be

admitted ; but the fact of all being in the same circumstances is against the deterioration implied.

In these remarks we assume that though the Jewish term *synagogue* denotes a Christian assembly or church, the use of it does not necessarily show an early period, because it may only imply the standpoint of the writer not an objective relation. Nothing can be inferred from it respecting Jewish Christians still meeting with their unbelieving brethren in the old synagogues—a thing most improbable. We have also assumed, that the *rich* and *poor* who are mentioned were Christian.

4. The author's argument about faith alone without works is inconsistent with an early date. In the time of Christ, a Pharisaic confidence in the law, apart from a holy life, was the besetting sin of the Jews. Had this given way when the epistle was composed? Either the controversy referred to in the 15th chapter of the Acts had not arisen ; or it had been settled. If it had not arisen, is it likely that confidence in the law, to the neglect of a pure life, had ceased? We believe not, else it must be assumed that such confidence was succeeded by reliance on exclusive purity of faith which the Jews carried over into Christianity; an assumption totally baseless, because Paul afterwards combats reliance on the law. Thus a late date alone is correct, one posterior to James himself. As the epistle contains no trace of a scrupulous observance of the Mosaic law on the part of the readers, the controversy respecting the continued obligation of the law, which Paul had carried to a successful issue, had produced its effect. To assert that it had not begun, or that the writer and his readers were agreed about the non-observance of the law, is to oppose all the testimony we have respecting James, who was an observer of the law moral and ceremonial, to the end of life. An early date disposes of the epistle's authenticity, as well as a late one.

5. If the author has borrowed Pauline ideas and

words, we have so far the evidence of a late date. The phrase *transgressor of the law*[1] is both in Rom. ii. 25, 27, and James ii. 11; the single term *transgressor* being used absolutely in Gal. ii. 18 and James ii. 9; *to fulfil the law*[2] occurs alike in Rom. ii. 27 and James ii. 8; *doer of the law, hearer of the law*,[3] are common to Rom. ii. 13 and James iv. 11, &c. &c.; *fruit of righteousness*[4] is found in Phil. i. 11 and James iii. 18; *be not deceived*[5] is in 1 Cor. vi. 9; xv. 33; Gal. vi. 7; and James i. 16; *but some one will say*[6] is common to 1 Cor. xv. 35 and James ii. 18; the word rendered *entire*[7] is in 1 Thess. v. 23; the term *members*[8] in James iii. 6; iv. 1, is frequent in Paul's epistles to the Romans and Corinthians; the verb translated *deceiving*[9] in James i. 22 appears in Coloss. ii. 4; and the word of God is termed the *perfect law of liberty* (James i. 25), a phrase apparently derived from Paul's liberal ideas. The apostle of the Gentiles was the first to bring the idea of law over into the department of Christianity in connection with freedom of conscience; and James applies it to the word of God because the transference had been made. It is true that Paul has always a polemic reference to the Mosaic law when he speaks of individual freedom, while such reference does not appear in James; but if the apostle of the Gentiles had already asserted that liberty with triumphant success, so that it could be considered an acknowledged fact, James had no need to look at the Mosaic law polemically where he speaks of the 'perfect law of liberty;' the phrase implies a recognition of freedom from that law which every Christian enjoyed, and consequently the priority of the Pauline ministry and writings which were the means of procuring that recognition. The attempt of Brückner[10] to show that the

[1] παραβάτης νόμου.
[2] νόμον τελεῖν.
[3] ποιητὴς τοῦ νόμου, ἀκροατὴς τοῦ νόμου.
[4] καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης.
[5] μὴ πλανᾶσθε.
[6] ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις.
[7] ὁλόκληρος.
[8] μέλη.
[9] παραλογίζεσθαι.
[10] In De Wette's *Handbuch*, iii. 1, p. 200, *et seq.*

controversy between the claims of law and gospel had not arisen when the author wrote about the freedom of the Christian's law, is unsuccessful ; as is his whole endeavour to obliterate all marks of the present letter's dependence on Pauline conceptions. The impression which the coincidences we have given make on an unbiassed mind, leads to the rejection of their independent origin.

6. The doctrine of justification by faith alone, is presupposed and denied by James. Could he do so without having reference to Paul's exposition of it ? We suppose not, because the apostle of the Gentiles was the first to bring out its importance, and hold it up as the essence of the gospel. It is improbable that the writer of our epistle should have spoken of justification as he does, unless an exposition well known among the Christian churches had preceded. Not only did the expressions *to be justified by faith, to be justified by works, justification by faith, justification by works*, originate with Paul, but he evolved the idea of justification by faith, which cannot be considered a necessary element in the gospel of the primitive apostles. In other words, the doctrine was not the common property of Christianity from the day of Pentecost, or one which Peter might have taught had he been thrown into circumstances where its express assertion against error was necessary. Brückner tries to fall back upon the *formulas* of the doctrine as Pauline, not *the thing itself*; but fails to show its extra-Pauline claim to be considered an integral part of the gospel. The doctrine and its formulas must go together ; and both are distinctively Pauline. Whatever be thought of his arguments, Huther is more consistent than Brückner in denying all dependence of the epistle upon Pauline thought.

It is unnecessary to show that the doctrine of justification by faith alone which Paul preached, and that of justification by works which James sets forth, are irre-

concilable. The single statement, 'Ye see how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only,' ii. 24, proves their contrariety. Yet their conciliation has been attempted from Calvin's time till the present, either by assuming that Paul speaks of justification before God, James of justification before men;[1] or that the latter refers to faith as his opponents understood it in the nineteenth verse; and to his own view of it in the succeeding ones. According to this hypothesis, James means a theoretical belief which is not a principle of moral conduct, a faith active in a sense, but not *the main source* of Christian practice. But it is plain that Paul speaks of faith being sufficient to justify without works, which James denies by saying that a man is not justified by faith *only*; for that Abraham's works not only accompanied his faith but the two *co-operated* in justification. The contradiction is not entirely obviated by Neander's observation that Paul looks at the objective-divine, the ground of election by God on which man's trust should rest; James at the subjective-human, which, presupposing the Divine fact whence all proceeds, man must perform on his part.[2] Nor is it removed by showing that James applies the same term to two distinct affections of the soul, the one passive, the other active, as long as it is admitted that the faith predicated of Abraham by both is a non-passive state of mind. However plausible Neander's exposition of the views given by James and Paul respectively concerning the justifying power of faith and works, it does not fully harmonise them. And if *he* has not succeeded in reconciling what is incapable of agreement, it may be assumed that others fail. It is easy to say that 'the truths which these two great

[1] 'Paulo esse gratuitam justitiæ imputationem apud Dei tribunal: Jacobo autem esse demonstrationem justitiæ ab effectis, idque apud homines.' — *Calvin in Jacobi Ep.* ii. 21.

[2] *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung, u. s. w.* zweyter Band, p. 864, vierte Auflage.

apostles were commissioned to teach were complementary and supplementary, but not contradictory of each other;' but the words, 'ye see then how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only,' plainly refute the dogmatic affirmation. On the other hand, the laboured attempts of Bishops Bull and O'Brien, with the artificial subtleties of Brückner, are repelled by common sense.

The difference arises from the views of human nature peculiar to the two authors. While Paul attributes reality only to the facts of consciousness, James assigns it to works that leave palpable marks on the outward world. The former emphasises the mental state, leaving its external manifestations out of account; the latter co-ordinates faith and works. To Paul, the ideal is the only real; to James the noumenal and actual, the internal and external are separate; a dualism which Paul commonly ignores. Semitic thought is reflected in James rather than Paul; the latter shewing his mental characteristics in holding forth the spiritual consciousness with which faith is identical. While their idiosyncrasies create an important discrepancy, the later has also respect to the earlier writer, giving his view by way of contrast and check.

The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith which had been abused by many, is combated in the epistle. James opposes the thing itself not its abuse. The dogma was unacceptable to Jewish Christians, whose modes of thinking could not be readily reconciled to it. We know that it was subsequently perverted; the apostle's view of faith being applied erroneously, to the detriment of practical religion. Such antinomianism was not of Jewish origin, but a Gnostic tendency, a speculative or ideal state of mind going beyond that of Paul.

The anti-Paulinism of the passage in James implies that Paul's writings had been current for a considerable

time. He himself had passed off the scene, without alienating Jewish Christians from the observance of the law, or detaching them from the doctrine of works cooperating with faith. The Jewish standpoint of the writer is visible, notwithstanding his Christian spirit.[1]

7. It is probable that the example of Rahab in ii. 25, was taken from the epistle to the Hebrews, though Bleek supposes that it may have been handed down orally by Paul and his disciples. Other allusions to the epistle to the Hebrews are Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, given here as an example of justification by works as opposed to justification by faith (James ii. 21 and Hebrews xi. 17); and the emphasising of a 'dead faith' over against 'dead works' (ii. 26 and Hebrews vi. 1). 'The fruit of righteousness sown in peace' is an echo of 'the peaceable fruit of righteousness' (iii. 18 and Hebrews xii. 11). These references imply the epistle's non-existence prior to A.D. 67.

8. There are also allusions to the Revelation; in i. 12 to Revelation ii. 10; and in i. 18 to Revelation xiv. 4; which reduce the date of the epistle to A.D. 69 at the earliest.

9. The direction to send for the elders of the church, and their use of oil with the prayer of faith, savours of a post-apostolic time. The original function of the elders was *government*; here another is given to them. The oil acquires a supernatural efficacy by virtue of their prayer, so as to cooperate in the cure of the diseased. The power of a natural remedy is exalted by the elders' prayer. If there be not in this a trace of the magical and theurgic, the writer ascribes to the office-bearers a power not altogether identical with the primitive gift of healing—that of converting prayer and oil into successful remedial agents of body and soul. Besides, the office of eldership is separated from the members of the church, a thing which did not exist in primitive Chris-

[1] See Holtzmann in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, vol. iii. p. 183, etc.

tianity; and a cure of souls points to a later period similar to that implied in 1 Tim. v. 17. Spiritual functions belonged originally to all the members; and the elders were to watch over general order and practice. Those afterwards called 'pastors and teachers' had the guidance of souls; the office of elder was originally confined to the church's outward guidance.

10. The passage v. 12 agrees with a text in the gospel according to the Hebrews, which the Clementines[1] also use. But we can hardly suppose that it was taken from that gospel. Christ's words about swearing, as they are recorded in his sermon on the mount (Matt. v. 34–37), were handed down orally; which accounts for their form being a little different in Matthew, James, the Clementines, and the Gospel of the Hebrews. Neither can we believe that the resemblances of certain places to others in the Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are free citations; though they are so regarded by Theile and Schwegler.[2] The ethical tendency of the works accounts for the resemblances in question. There is no good reason for bringing down the origin of the epistle to the time of the apostolic fathers.

11. The fact that the essential doctrines of Christianity, the death of Christ, atonement by His blood, the influence of the Holy Spirit, recede into the background, as they do in the Clementines, does not show a post-apostolic origin, as Kern supposed. Hilgenfeld argues for a somewhat late date of the epistle from ii. 6–7, v. 6, because legal courts for trying Christians were not instituted before Domitian (A.D. 81–96). The basis is too slender to support the conclusion. Formal legal courts authorised by the emperor need not be found in the passages. The most probable date appears to be

[1] iii. 55.

[2] Compare James i. 5 with Sirach xx. 15; i. 10 with Sirach ii. 9; i. 13 with Sirach xv. 11; v. 1 with Wisdom v. 8; v. 6 with Wisdom ii. 20 and Sirach xxxi. 22.

the end of A.D. 69 or 70, between the death of Paul and the destruction of Jerusalem. We agree with Grimm that it was not written before A.D. 69, but cannot with Blom assume A.D. 80; nor the reign of Domitian, with Hilgenfeld.

### AUTHENTICITY AND CANONICITY.

Clement of Rome, Hermas, and Irenæus are cited in favour of the epistle. The first writes to the Corinthians: 'Abraham, called (God's) friend, was found faithful, in that he was obedient to the words of God. . . . . Through faith and hospitality, a son was given him in his old age; and by obedience he offered him a sacrifice to God' (compare James ii. 21–23).[1]

Again: 'By faith and hospitality, Rahab the harlot was saved' (compare James ii. 25 and Hebr. xi. 31).[2]

The former passage makes it probable that Clement had read the epistle, the second is uncertain. Others quoted by Lardner and Kirchhofer are doubtful.

It is also supposed that Hermas has alluded to our epistle at least in one place: 'For if ye resist him (the devil), he will flee from you with confusion' (compare James iv. 7).[3] This testimony is uncertain, because the saying was a current one.

But although the passages in Hermas that appear to be reminiscences of our epistle are not decisive, it is very probable that the one was acquainted with the other, because their point of view is similar. Both look at Christianity in its ethical aspect, separate the rich and poor widely, and present no christology.

Irenæus seems to have known the epistle when he writes: 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God' (James ii. 23).[4]

[1] *Ad. Cor.* c. 10. [2] *Ibid.* c. 12. [3] *Mandat.* xii. 5.

[4] 'Ipse Abraham . . . . . credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est.'—*Adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. xvi. 2, p. 1016, ed. Migne.

It will be observed, that none of these writers refers to the epistle as *Scripture* or *canonical* or *written by James*. Their evidence simply attests the existence of it when they wrote.

The first writer who expressly mentions the writer is Origen: 'For though it be called faith, if it be without works it is dead, as we read in the epistle current as James's.'[1]

The word here rendered *current* may indicate a doubt in Origen's mind whether James really wrote the epistle. In parts of his works which exist only in Rufinus's Latin version,[2] the letter is cited as the apostle James's, the brother of our Lord; it is even styled 'the divine epistle of the apostle James;' but such expressions may be interpolated.

Eusebius states that Clemens Alexandrinus made brief comments on all the catholic epistles;[3] and Cassiodorus says that he explained the canonical epistles, i.e. the first of Peter, the first and second of John, and the epistle of Jude.[4] It is improbable that he commented on *all* the catholic epistles. He has nowhere quoted or alluded to that of James. The fragments of Dionysius of Alexandria are too doubtful to be cited as his, though Hug uses them.

Tertullian never mentions the epistle. The three passages given by Lardner and Kirchhofer, bearing some resemblance to parts of James, are insufficient to prove his use of it. And yet he employed the canonical books of the New Testament, even the short epistle to Philemon. In his 'Scorpiace,'[5] after citing

[1] ἐὰν γὰρ λέγηται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνῃ, νεκρά ἐστιν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν.—*Comment. in Joann.* tom xix. (*Opp.* iv. p. 306).

[2] Commentary in Ep. ad Rom. lib. iv.—*Opp.* iv. p. 535. *Ibid.* p. 536, lib. ix. p. 654. Hom. 3 in Psalm xxxvi. p. 671. Hom. 13 in Gen., 3 and 8 in Exod., 2 in Levit.

[3] *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14.

[4] *Institut. Divin. Scriptur.* c. viii. *Judæ* not *Jacobi* is the right reading.

[5] Cap. 8.

Peter, John, and Paul, he has nothing from James, though passages in his letter were appropriate. It is still more remarkable that he does not appeal to James, v. 16, in his treatise on prayer. He either knew nothing of the epistle ; or knowing, rejected it as uncanonical. The latter is the more probable.

The Muratorian fragment on the canon passes over the epistle ; and the Pseudo-Clementine writings have no trace of it.

Eusebius puts it among the antilegomena. His words are : 'But of the controverted, though well known (or approved) by many, are that called the epistle of James,' &c.[1] Elsewhere the historian writes : 'Thus far concerning James, who is said to be the author of the first of the seven epistles called *catholic*. It should be observed, however, that it is reckoned spurious : at least, not many of the ancients have mentioned it,' &c.[2]

These words of Eusebius will bear two meanings. They may express his own opinion about the epistle, viz. that it is spurious ; or they may represent the opinion of others in his day, viz. that it was commonly rejected. With Rufinus and others we adopt the latter view, chiefly because the historian quotes the epistle elsewhere as 'the holy apostle's,' and 'Scripture,'[3] terms inconsistent with the idea of its spuriousness. Yet Eusebius uses the appellation 'apostle' loosely ; and does not attribute the same authority to our epistle as he does to those of Paul.

Hippolytus appears to quote the epistle, but not as Scripture or James's : 'for judgment is without

[1] *τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα.—H. E.* iii. 25.

[2] *τοιαῦτα δὲ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται· ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μέν· οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, κ.τ.λ.—Ibid.* ii. 23.

[3] 'Compare *Comment. in Psalmos*, Psalm c.—*Opp.* vol. v. p. 1244, ed. Migne.

mercy to him that has not showed mercy' (James ii. 13).[1]

Jerome acknowledged the authenticity: 'James, called the Lord's brother, surnamed the Just, wrote but one epistle, which is among the seven catholic ones; which is also said to have been published by another in his name, though it has gradually obtained authority, in process of time.'[2]

Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it, as we learn from Leontius of Byzantium.

The Peshito or old Syriac version has the epistle. Hence Ephrem speaks of it as written by James the Lord's brother. The canon of the Syrian church affords important evidence in favour of the epistle's authenticity.

This summary of early testimony is not favourable to the canonical authority of our letter. Among the Greeks till the fourth century, its reception was not universal; nor was it approved by many. Its credit afterwards increased, so that it was generally received as canonical in the fifth century. The Latin church took little notice of the epistle for some centuries. The synod of Carthage (A.D. 397), put it into the canon. The Latin as well as the Greek church made small use of the work till the fourth century, both being suspicious of its authenticity; but the Syrian church received it early.

## LEADING OBJECT.

The object of the writer is to admonish the readers, to censure the errors connected with their Christian life,

[1] ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνιλεώς ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος.—*Treatise concerning the End of the World and Antichrist*, p. 122, ed. P. de Lagarde.

[2] 'Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus . . . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quæ de septem catholicis est, quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem.'—*Catal. Script. Eccles.* c. 2.

and to console them in adverse circumstances. They were guilty of improprieties. Their faults needed rectification, and they are reproved. They were exposed to outward trials and suffering from oppression. He exhorts them to be patient and steadfast, maintaining their trust in the divine word amid discouragements. Thus his object was to reprove, comfort, exhort, and encourage. Aware of the general circumstances affecting them and the errors they had committed, he addresses them in a practical style.

It is impossible to discover any definite cause which led the unknown author to write in James's name. Only one part of the epistle is polemic (ii. 14–26), while the rest is commonly corrective and conciliatory. Everything personal and individual is absent from the letter, because James writing from Jerusalem to Christians scattered abroad, could have known little of them except in a general way. Doubtless the author's motive was good; so that he speaks with authority to the brethren, reproving them for their worldliness and exposing their faults.

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WRITER AND HIS READERS.

The nature of the epistle is peculiar, forming a contrast to Paul's writings, since the author's standpoint is Jewish rather than Christian. The ideas are cast in a Jewish mould. The very name of Christ occurs but twice (i. 1; ii. 1), and His atonement is scarcely touched. We see little more than the threshold of the new system. It is the teaching of a Christian Jew, rather than of one who had reached a true apprehension of the essence of Christ's religion. The doctrinal development is imperfect. It is only necessary to read the entire epistle to perceive the truth of these remarks. In warning his readers against transgression of the law by partiality to individuals, the author adduces Jewish rather than

Christian motives (ii. 8–13). The greater part of the 3rd chapter respecting the government of the tongue is of the same character, in which Christ's example is not once alluded to; the illustrations being taken from objects in nature. The warning against uncharitable judgment does not refer to Christ, or to God who puts his Spirit in the hearts of believers, but to the law (iv. 10–12). He who judges his neighbour, judges the law. The exhortation to feel and act under constant remembrance of the dependence of our life on God, belongs to the same category (iv. 13–17). He that knows good without doing it, is earnestly admonished to practise virtue and to avoid self-security, without reference to motives connected with redemption. Job and the prophets are quoted as examples of patience, not Christ; and the efficacy of prayer is proved by the instance of Elias, without allusion to the Redeemer's promise (v. 17). The epistle is wound up after the same Jewish fashion; though the opportunity of mentioning Christ, who gave himself a sacrifice for sin, presented itself naturally.

The very method in which the author writes is Hebraistic. His sentences are short and weighty, like the proverbial sayings of the Jews. Their connection is feeble, one following another without a clear link of union. Even when a subject is treated more fully than usual, an epigrammatic sentence closes it (i. 5–8, 13–16, 22–27; ii. 1–13, 14–26; iii. 1–5, 6–8, 13–18; iv. 1–10, 13–17; v. 7–10). The author's mode of proof is by the law, and by examples occurring in the Old Testament.

The phenomena of the epistle have been explained in two ways, on the assumption of its authenticity. With Neander and Messner some believe that James remained in the narrow circle of doctrinal ideas here unfolded, and that he could do little more than conduct his countrymen from the old dispensation to the new. Being a teacher of the Jewish rather than the Christian system,

he was unable to instruct men in Christian knowledge. Others believe that James adapted his method of instruction to the persons addressed, because their knowledge was elementary and they could not bear advanced doctrines. Neither explanation accounts for the character of the epistle. The resemblance of many sentiments in the epistle to the sermon on the mount arises from the writer's Jewish Christian standpoint. As the discourses of Jesus are ethical not dogmatic, representing a purified and enlarged Judaism, the sentiments and language of the letter approach them. By comparing James i. 5, 6, with Matt. vii. 7, xxi. 22 ; ii. 5 with Matt. v. 3 ; ii. 8 with Matt. xxii. 39 ; ii. 13 with Matt. vii. 1, 2 ; iii. 1 with Matt. xxiii. 8–14 ; iii. 12 with Matt. vii. 16 ; iii. 18 with Matt. v. 9 ; v. 12, 13, with Matt. v. 34–37, the agreement is readily perceived. The writer did not quote the written gospel of Matthew as a well-known document ; for no passage in the epistle exhibits a clear reference to it ; and the attempts to find such are unavailing. The teachings of Christ were better known by oral tradition than written forms ; and the point of view taken by an Ebionite writer must be substantially like that embodied in the precepts of Christ ; an early, simple, practical, spiritualised Judaism, not the dogmatic Pauline system, which presents a later development of the old religion.

In comparison with Paul's writings, the epistle is retrograde. Christianity would have been a different thing had it continued upon a platform like that of the Old Testament, or been developed along its lines. Compared with Paulinism, the teaching is objective and practical, having none of the characteristics which the apostle derived from the depths of his own consciousness. It is ethical not doctrinal ; and deals with conduct rather than consciousness. Yet it has a value of its own ; and should not be depreciated in Luther's way.

The picture of the Jewish Christians is not minute,

but consists of a few general strokes wanting specific colouring. Graphic as far as it extends, it is neither definite nor complete. The believers presented the following features :—

1. They had comfortable places of assembling for worship and presiding elders. Teaching was not yet restricted to the office-bearers, since many were eager to instruct their brethren (ii. 2, 6, 7 ; v. 14 ; iii. 1).

2. They were commonly poor, though there were also several rich among them who were elated with their condition (i. 10, 11).

3. They were oppressed in various ways by the rich. Under the weight of privations and persecutions, they were inclined to shield themselves from responsibility by pleading the power of outward temptations, which they ascribed to God's providence (i. 11–13 ; ii. 6 ; v. 8–11).

4. In their assemblies they showed partiality to the rich on account of differences in worldly station, to the prejudice of Christian love (ii. 1–6, 8–13).

5. Their hearts were not deeply penetrated by the power of religion. They were largely under the dominion of worldly lusts and inordinate desires. They showed violence of temper, sought to effect their object by contention, were envious, uncharitable, censorious ; and did not put that restraint on their language which prevented swearing in ordinary conversation. Their hearts, in short, were too much set upon the world (i. 19–21 ; iii. 10–18 ; iv. ; v. 12).

6. Besides violating the law of love, they overvalued faith to the neglect of works, contenting themselves with an assent to the truth of Christianity which left their hearts unchanged and produced no good fruits in the life (ii. 14–26).

7. They were also too forward to assume the office of religious teachers, many pressing into that duty, who had no proper control over their tongue or right views of their responsibility (iii. 1, &c.).

## LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

The epistle was not translated from an Aramæan original but was composed in Greek, and shows a good acquaintance with this language on the part of the author. The words employed are generally pure, select, and appropriate. The Hebraisms are few; it is difficult to account for such purity of diction in one who resided at Jerusalem all his life, and did not take the free direction of Paul with regard to Christianity. Occasionally, however, there is an artificial air about the style, and an absence of that easy flow which bespeaks a perfect mastery of language. Some expressions are peculiar and unusual, as the term translated *ways* (i. 11);[1] the participle rendered *of his own will* (i. 18);[2] the phrase *when ye fall into divers temptations* (i. 2);[3] *shadow of turning* (i. 17);[4] *he begat* (i. 18).[5] The most prominent feature of the author's style is its graphic liveliness and oratorical cast, exemplified in numerous comparisons and metaphors, the accumulation of predicates, verbs, and interrogatives. There are even genuine poetical expressions, as in i. 14, &c.; iii. 5, &c.; v. 1, &c., where the imagery is luxuriant. The composition may be characterised as a whole by sententiousness; the diction by elegance and fitness. The hexameter in i. 17, has nothing to do with the reading of Greek verses or the citation of Christian hymns; the words flowed forth unconsciously, as sometimes happens to good prose writers. Our author was familiar with the Hebrew prophets; and his manner, which is bold, aspiring and vigorous, resembles theirs. His denunciations are powerful, his strokes nervous and weighty, so that he even becomes sublime at times.

Bishop Jebb adduces many examples of the paral-

[1] πορεῖαι.
[2] βουληθείς.
[3] ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις.
[4] τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα.
[5] ἀπεκύησεν.

lelism characteristic of Hebrew poetry, and traces the train of thought with much ingenuity, representing James as a logician and poet together.[1] But these refined speculations have no proper basis; the parallelisms and logical connection being often imaginary. The epistle has a persuasive character, and the style is elevated; but the poetical is not its prevailing feature, and the logical scarcely appears.

### ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The letter does not admit of formal division, being without plan or order. Hence the ideas are repeated. The writer passes rapidly from one topic to another, returning at intervals to his main purpose without logical connection. We divide the work into a succession of paragraphs, in the following manner:—

(*a.*) The inscription and salutation (verse 1).

(*b.*) An exhortation to the readers to take joyfully their privations, sufferings, and poverty; to be steadfast under them, and to aim at Christian perfection, even through such discipline (i. 2–4).

(*c.*) Placed in trying circumstances, they are exhorted to ask wisdom from God without doubting, firmly relying on his mercy (i. 5–8).

(*d.*) The joy referred to before in the midst of their trials, would be experienced in the state of their own minds, in their inward consciousness; and they would receive the reward of steadfastness, after their trials, in a crown of life (i. 9–12).

(*e.*) Should privations and sufferings tempt to evil, the fault must not be imputed to God the Father of lights, the giver of all good gifts; but to themselves and their sinful lusts (i. 13–18).

(*f.*) He exhorts his readers to appreciate the word of God more and more; and not only to hear, but to practise it (i. 19–27).

[1] *Sacred Literature, etc.* § xiv. p. 273, *et seq.*

(*g.*) He censures them because of their partiality to the rich in their assemblies for worship, and their contempt for the poor, which is a violation of the great law of love ; a law he exhorts them to observe (ii. 1–13).

(*h.*) As faith should not be without love, so it should not be without works, the author refuting the persons who alleged that they had faith while showing no evidence of it in the life, and supposing themselves justified by faith alone (ii. 14–26).

(*i.*) A warning is now introduced against forwardness in assuming the office of religious teachers, since a great responsibility is incurred by every one who attempts to guide and instruct others. This leads the author to speak of the frequent abuse of the tongue. One should show his wisdom by meekness and humility, not by litigiousness. There is an earthly and a heavenly wisdom ; the former appearing where strife and envying are ; the latter, accompanied with purity and peace (ch. iii.).

(*j.*) Evil passions are condemned as the source of contention and violence (iv. 1–3).

(*k.*) A solemn warning follows, and an exhortation to repentance addressed to the worldly-minded and sinners (iv. 4–10).

(*l.*) The writer condemns detraction and censoriousness (iv. 11, 12).

(*m.*) He censures forgetfulness of dependence on God, by showing the irreligious confidence in worldly undertakings displayed by many (iv. 13–17).

(*n.*) Here is a threatening against the rich, who, abandoning themselves to every gratification, had deprived the innocent of the means of subsistence (v. 1–6).

(*o.*) Christians suffering from the oppression of the rich are exhorted to patience, and comforted with the idea of the Lord's near approach (v. 7–11).

(*p.*) We have a dissuasive against swearing in conversation (v. 12).

(*q*.) Prayer is recommended in a variety of situations (v. 13–18).

(*r*.) The epistle concludes with the importance and blessedness of endeavouring to reclaim an erring brother from the evil of his ways (v. 19, 20).

There is no proper termination, but an abrupt and unusual ending without an apostolic benediction.

Though the epistle occupies a place in the canon subordinate to the Pauline writings, it is full of valuable lessons. It breathes a healthy spirit, and presents views of life which are eminently Christian. All is referred to God, the great author and upholder of the world. Its practical tone is a preservative against the Pauline element in excess, or the antinomianism which relies on faith to the neglect of works. The precepts contain a sound morality, over against the doctrinal and speculative element for which Paul's epistles are quoted. A production which associates divine causality with the steadfastness of an active and pure life, may well rebuke the theoretical religion which relies on dogma for acceptance with God.

Luther's judgment of its value is expressed with his usual energy. 'In comparison with the best books of the New Testament, it is a downright strawy epistle, is not an apostolic production, directly ascribes justification to works contrary to Paul and all other Scripture, makes no mention of the sufferings, resurrection, and Spirit of Christ, and throws one thing into another without order.'[1] The result which the reformer arrives at is that the writer lived long after Peter and Paul. His spiritual instinct appears in some of these statements. He is right in saying that it is not evangelical from a Pauline point of view; and that it contradicts the

[1] See Luther's *Werke*, xiv. pp. 105, 148, etc., ed. Walch. The longest statements are in the preface to James's epistle in the edition of the New Testament published in 1522. The epithet 'strawy' epistle occurs in the preface to the edition of 1524.

apostle of the Gentiles in relation to the doctrine of justification. But it is a valuable letter notwithstanding, because dogmatic does not constitute the essence of Christianity, which has an ethical side as important as the speculative. Doctrines are but opinions—ethics are spirit and life.

# SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

CONTENTS.

THE second epistle to the Thessalonians may be divided into three parts: i. 3–12; ii. 1–17; iii. 1–18.

1. After an introduction, the writer thanks God for the progress of the Thessalonian believers in faith and love, as well as their steadfastness amid persecution. He had often spoken of them in commendation, and assures them that though persecuted now, they should be recompensed at the coming of Christ, while their enemies would be overthrown. It was his continual prayer to God that they might persevere, and become complete in the Christian character that the name of the Lord might be glorified in them (i. 3–12).

2. He warns them against the notion that the day of the Lord is just at hand, on which point they had been needlessly agitated; and shows the groundlessness of their fears. The man of sin and son of perdition, was first to appear, and sit in the temple of God. Though the mystery of iniquity had begun to work, there was a restraining influence. After the removal of that barrier, antichrist would be revealed in all his ungodliness, to be signally destroyed. The apostle, however, thanks God that the Thessalonians had been chosen to salvation, admonishing them to stand fast by the instructions he had given, and praying that they might do so by divine help (ii.).

3. He requests his readers to pray for him that he might be successful in spreading Christianity throughout the world, and be preserved from the malice of the wicked Jews. He again expresses his confidence in them, and good wishes on their behalf, annexing a command respecting the idle and disorderly, that the true believers should withdraw from their society. He reminds them of his own example, stating that he had worked with his hands for a subsistence among them, although he had power to require support. Should these persons not amend, he counsels the others to discountenance them, and use the most likely methods of bringing about repentance. The epistle concludes with a salutation written with his own hand, to serve as a mark of authenticity, distinguishing his letters from forgeries which are but vaguely referred to (iii.).

## AUTHENTICITY.

External evidence attests the letter's authenticity. Polycarp writes: 'Be ye also moderate in this, and do not count such as enemies, but call them back, as suffering and erring members' (2 Thess. iii. 15).[1]

The epistle of Polycarp to the church at Philippi is not authentic, hence it must be used with discretion as evidence for the New Testament books.

Justin Martyr seems to refer to it in these words: 'When also the man of apostasy, who, speaking great things against the Most High, shall dare to commit lawless deeds against us Christians on the earth,' etc.[2] It must be admitted, however, that the reference of these words to the Thessalonian epistle is doubful. As

[1] *νήφετε οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τούτῳ, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθροὺς ἡγεῖσθε τοὺς τοιούτους, ἀλλ' ὡς μέλη παθητὰ καὶ πεπλανημένα αὐτοὺς ἀνακαλεῖσθε, ἵνα ὅλον ὑμῶν τὸ σῶμα σώζητε.—Ad Philipp.* c. xi.

[2] *ὅταν καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ εἰς τὸν ὕψιστον ἔξαλλα λαλῶν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνομα τολμήσῃ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, κ.τ.λ.—Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 371, cap. 110, p. 390, ed. 3 Otto.

Justin never mentions Paul, nor quotes him expressly, but ascribes the honour of a mission to the Gentiles to the twelve apostles exclusively, he may not have known Paul's epistles, or may have ignored them if he did. The coincidences which Otto has pointed out between his language and that of the Pauline epistles are very uncertain. Probably he knew but ignored his letters, attributing no apostolic authority to them, after the example of the Jewish Christians. As to the agreement between Justin and Paul in their common quotations from the Septuagint, which has been adduced as evidence of the influence of the latter upon the former, it is explained by the fact that the text of that version had been altered between the time of Paul and Justin after the Hebrew original and Paul's quotations. The Christians had been compelled to amend the version on account of their disputes with the Jews who found fault with it.

Irenæus (177–192) writes: 'And again in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, speaking of antichrist, "And then shall the wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus Christ shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the presence of his coming; even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders."'[1]

Tertullian († 220–240) has this language: 'And in the second epistle to the same persons he [Paul] writes with greater solicitude, "But I beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, nor be troubled,"' etc.[2]

[1] 'Et iterum in secunda ad Thessalonicenses, de antichristo dicens, ait, "Et tunc revelabitur iniquus quem Dominus Jesus Christus interficiet spiritu oris sui, et destruet præsentia adventus sui, illum cujus est adventus secundum operationem Satanæ, in omni virtute et signis, et portentis mendacii."' —*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 7. 2.

[2] 'Et in secunda, pleniore sollicitudine ad eosdem, "Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per adventum Domini nostri Jesù Christi, et congregationem nostram ad illum, ne cito commoveamini animo, neque turbemini,"' etc.—*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 24.

Clement of Alexandria († 220) writes: 'And the apostle says, "There is not in every man that knowledge. But pray ye that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men, for all men have not faith."'[1]

It is also in the old Syriac (about 200), the old Latin (170), and the canon of Muratori (180). Marcion's list (about 140) had it.

As far as external evidence goes, the epistle is well authenticated. Such evidence, however, does not reach back far enough to make it conclusive, and may be overbalanced by internal considerations. In the present case, internal evidence has been advanced against historical tradition. Whether it be sufficient to negative the Pauline authorship of the letter, is subject to debate; for testimony affects different minds in varying lights, and old beliefs are long-lived.

1. The prominent and peculiar paragraph in chapter ii. 1–12 contains un-Pauline ideas, and cannot be harmonised with the first letter which says that the second advent will be sudden and unexpected. The writer himself believes that he shall live to see it: 'We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent,' etc. (iv. 15). This belief is corrected in the second epistle, the Thessalonian converts being told that the event is not imminent, because it will be preceded both by the apostasy and the revelation of the man of sin. Things are interposed between the readers and the second advent to allay their excited feelings, and bring them back to the ordinary duties of life. The first epistle describes the time of the coming as uncertain, and without signs betokening its nearness. The second contains definite preluding signs. The first asserts the apostle's belief that he should see it himself;

[1] *οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι, φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἡ γνῶσις· προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις.*—*Stromata*, v., vol. ii. p. 655, ed. Potter.

the second removes that belief to a distance. Whence this change within a short time? The progress of events could not have caused it. Paul expressed the expectation of witnessing the second advent in the first epistle to the Corinthians (xv. 51). Did he write in the first epistle to the Thessalonians that he should be alive at the coming of the Lord, correct that belief soon after in the second epistle, and revert to his original idea in addressing the Corinthians? The inconsistency cannot be explained by the fact that the writer's mind not being stereotyped was subject to change, particularly on such a subject as the second advent; because the epistle, if authentic, was but little behind the former in point of time. A sudden change of this sort cannot be attributed to him; especially as he afterwards enunciated his first opinion. We are ready to admit development in the mind of the apostle. But the subject of the second advent, though not of primary importance in his view, was too momentous to be tossed about in thought from immediateness to remoteness of occurrence. Nothing certain was known about it; yet its nearness supplied a comfort to the spirits of Paul and the first Christians which could not have been easily relinquished. The expectation of surviving such an event must have been cherished by the ardent apostle of the Gentiles. The author also reminds his readers that he had told them before of the preparatory phenomena; so that both his oral teaching and written words (ii. 1–12) clash with the statement of the first epistle.

The man of sin, and *the thing* or *person that checks*, are peculiar and original. Such hindrances to the realisation of the divine kingdom and the glorious manifestation of its Sovereign are absent from Paul's writings. Had they entered into his doctrinal teachings, we should have certainly expected them in places where the second advent and its concomitants are spoken of; especially in 1 Cor. xv. 23, etc. Yet he is silent about them

there. They are not touched upon, explained, or modified by any subsequent statement. Genuine Pauline eschatology ignores the precursors which are prominent in the second epistle to the Thessalonians and it is said had formed part of the apostle's oral teaching.

The interpretation of the man of sin or son of perdition as well as of the checking power is difficult. Probably the Roman empire is meant. Antichrist, or the man of sin, may be Nero; and he that checks, a Roman emperor, such as Vespasian. This view is favoured by a comparison of the passage with the Revelation; especially as the latter seems to have suggested the portrait. According to the Revelation, the beast, 'that was, and is, and goeth into *perdition*,' is Nero; in the Thessalonian epistle he is the son of *perdition*. The 'falling away' is paralleled by the worship of the dragon and the beast described in the thirteenth chapter of the Revelation; the self-exaltation and self-deification mentioned in the epistle find their type in the account of the beast who claims and accepts worship, in the same chapter. 'The coming after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders' is paralleled by the language of the Revelation in xix. 20; while the Lord who consumes the lawless one with the spirit of his mouth and the brightness of his coming, resembles him who slays with the two-edged sword proceeding out of his mouth, and whose eyes are like a flame of fire (Rev. i. 14–16). The correspondence of our epistle and the Revelation can hardly be mistaken. The man of sin, though depicted differently, is still identical. The description in the Revelation is scenic and dramatic; while the author of the epistle combines the various traits, and gives his conception compact expression. But the phenomenon in both is still veiled. Had fifteen years elapsed between the times of the second epistle and the Apocalypse, it would have been clearer in the latter. Reuss speaks of the progress of events

enabling the apostle John to designate antichrist by a proper name (xiii. 18);[1] but the mystery thrown around Nero in the Revelation is as great as it is in the epistle. The march of events did not remove the veil; for the same personage appears in shaded outline on the political horizon. If Nero be the man of sin, and the reigning emperor the hindrance to his developed power, the writer drew his picture of him about the end of 69, when the report was commonly believed that he was in retirement among the Parthians, collecting an army.

It has been thought that the passage is susceptible of an interpretation consistent with Pauline authorship. If Claudius be the withholder, as Hitzig ingeniously conjectures,[2] the apostle might have divined the future even in A.D. 52 or 53, and foreseen the iniquity hidden in Nero. The supposition, however, is scarcely admissible. The early part of Nero's life and reign gave no indications of his subsequent wickedness; and the apostle himself, writing to the Romans some years after, enjoins obedience to this very emperor (xiii. 1, etc.).

The difficulties of the paragraph before us have baffled many inquirers, and cannot be entirely removed by the most careful exegesis. The precise meaning of the language, *sitting in the temple of God, the apostasy, the gathering to him, the mystery of iniquity*, etc., can only be conjectured. How far the writer reflected the ideas of the time after Nero's death, and how far he drew from his own imagination, can only be guessed. In addition to the Revelation, it is probable that he had regard to the book of Daniel (xi. 36), whose fourth empire was referred to Rome, and where Antiochus typified antichrist. He may also have had respect to the gathering together of the elect mentioned in Mat-

[1] *Les Epîtres Pauliniennes*, tome premier, p. 68.
[2] Qui claudit = ὁ κατέχων.

thew xxiv. 31, when he speaks of 'our gathering together unto him.' But the Jewish Christian picture which the first gospel gives of the second advent and its concomitants is modified. The false Christs had already given place to the beast in the Revelation; and one person usurps the place of God, lording it over the Christians. Though the second advent is painted in sensuous colours in the first epistle, the fact is not inconsistent with the early origin of that document; but the event was gradually disengaged from the features given it by Judaism in the mind of Paul. A political aspect of the Divine kingdom did not comport with his eschatological ideas. The sensuous traits would naturally decrease (comp. 1 Thess. with 1 Cor. xv.), and the closing scene of the world be dissociated from earthly empires, as though their power were an insignificant element.

We believe that the language of our epistle points to a *person* not *a thing*. He that exalts himself above all who are worshipped, who sits in the temple of God showing himself that he is God, cannot be converted into a Christian heresy like Gnosticism. Yet Hilgenfeld explains the passage in that way, resolving the phrase *to sit in the temple of God* into 'to be enthroned in Christianity.'

The entire passage is unlike any that occurs in Paul's epistles. Though it is not impossible he might have written it, the improbability of its coming from him is great. The view taken of the kingdom of God is not the subjective one peculiar to the apostle, but is shaped after the Jewish theocracy, being realised in the manner of the Messianic reign which the Jews expected, instead of by the inward consciousness attaching itself to the death of Christ as the means of salvation. In 1 Cor. xv. the last enemy to be subdued is not antichrist but death; while the second advent is not delayed by intervening obstacles, but is considered

just at hand. The Roman empire is not a restraining power keeping back antichrist and with him the coming of Christ, as in the present epistle.

The man of sin was to some extent an ideal personage of the first century, embodying varying conceptions. He was the concentrated essence of that enmity to Christianity which appeared in different forms. The imagination of the early believers viewed the enmity as a person or as a thing; either outside Christianity, as Judaism or heathenism; or within the church, as false teachers, whose Gnostic views misrepresented the true person of Christ. The antichristian power fluctuated between unity and plurality, according to the notions of different times.

No being of gigantic intellect is prophetically described. No system, Gnosticism, Judaism, Romanism, Protestantism, is shadowed forth. Preterist and futurist expounders of prophecy are equally mistaken in seeking the fulfilment of the passage in history, because it is not prophetic but apocalyptic, expressing notions on a subject that concerns neither faith nor duty—notions having merely a historical interest so far as they relate to primitive Christianity emerging out of Judaism and assuming an independent position. The author speaks enigmatically, feeling that he had nothing definite to predict, and that it was dangerous to particularise the Roman empire.

These remarks are consistent with the author's inspiration, though not with that view of it which assumes infallibility. His subjectivity mingled with and formed his inspiration. We take the New Testament writers as guides to faith and practice generally, without adopting all that they propounded or believing that they knew the future.

2. The idea of recompence in the kingdom of God for sufferings endured by the Thessalonians is scarcely Pauline. The apostle always teaches that future blessed-

ness is the reward of free grace, irrespective of human desert or agency; whereas the notion of worthiness is introduced in ch. i. 4–7. The construction of the passage is somewhat difficult because the clauses are not logically connected; but thus much is clear, viz. that recompence is attached to the conduct and endurance of the readers, in an un-Pauline way.

Again, everlasting destruction is said to be the doom not only of the Gentiles who know not God, but of the Jews who obey not the gospel (i. 8, 9). Yet the epistle to the Romans expresses a hope that the mass of the Jews shall be saved. The final happiness of all Israel cheers the heart of their kinsman (xi. 25, 26). In i. 11, Christian *calling* coincides with the recompence bestowed by God on His people in the day when Christ shall be revealed, and is presented as the goal of life. It is a thing reached or attained at last; the consummation of spiritual life. The apostle, on the contrary, uniformly regards it as an initiatory step or introduction into the church of Christ. Instead of making it a goal, he speaks of it as the beginning of true life in God's kingdom. When vocation is referred to its author, it belongs to the Divine purpose; when it is viewed as an element of individual life on earth, it is an act of initiation into all Christian privileges. Chap. ii. 14 is Pauline; i. 11 is not.

3. The number of peculiar phrases and of words occurring but once in the epistle, strengthens suspicion against its Pauline origin. In this respect it presents a contrast to the first. Paul writes simply *we give thanks*; here the corresponding phrase is, *we are bound to give thanks*, to which is added, *as it is meet* (comp. 1 Thess. 1, 2, with 2 Thess. i. 3). *Election to salvation* is expressed by a different verb from that which Paul uses (ii. 13).[1] *To receive the love of the truth*[2] occurs instead of *to receive the word* (ii. 10, comp. 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 13). *The*

[1] εἵλατο, not ἐκλέγεσθαι. [2] τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας δεξάσθαι.

*work of faith* (i. 11)[1] is un-Pauline. Artificial phrases are, *to be glorified in his saints, to be admired in all them that believe, our testimony among you was believed* (i. 10),[2] *to fulfil all the good pleasure of goodness* (i. 11),[3] *in faith of the truth* (ii. 13).[4] *And* is prefixed to *for this reason*, contrary to Paul's manner (ii. 11).[5]

4. The salutation at the close, added by the apostle's hand as a token that the letter is authentic, looks as if a later writer wished to ward off objection, and to attest its Pauline origin. When the apostle appended a salutation, he did it as a mark of his love, not for authentication. The expression *in every epistle* increases the difficulty of accepting the Pauline authorship; for the apostle had written but one, the first to the Thessalonians. It may be, however, that some are lost. It may be, also, that forged ones had been circulated in Thessalonica; and that the statement refers to them as if the writer would attest all that he should compose henceforward, with his own signature. Many think that the phrase 'nor by letter as from us' (ii. 2) alludes to a supposititious epistle which the Thessalonians had received. But it rather refers to a Pauline writing, not to the present first, but to one which has only been preserved in such parts of the present second as were retained by the man who rewrote and altered it. The preceding phrase 'by word' (Paul's oral instruction) makes it probable that 'the letter as proceeding from us' was an authentic one which the Thessalonians misunderstood.

One thing appears, viz. that this authentication by Paul himself implies a time when supposititious epistles were in circulation, and tokens of authenticity were

[1] ἔργον πίστεως.

[2] ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύσασιν, ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

[3] πληροῦν πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης.

[4] πίστει ἀληθείας.

[5] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο.

looked for—a time posterior to the commencement of the apostle's letter-writing activity.

5. The ideas are often borrowed or repeated from the first epistle. Perhaps this might be attributed to Paul himself, in a measure; but scarcely so far or in such a way as is now done. The first two verses are verbally the same with parts of the preceding epistle. *Faith* and *love*, for which thanks are given to God, reappear in the same context but are intensified: 'your faith *groweth exceedingly*,' and 'love *aboundeth*' (i. 3). 2 Thess. ii. 13 repeats what had been said at i. 3, with the application of the words to the readers, 'brethren beloved of the Lord,' which Paul never uses. 2 Thess. iii. 8 repeats 1 Thess. ii. 9; and iii. 10, 12, is an expansion of 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12. A considerable part of our epistle, by enlarging, modifying, and repeating its statements, recalls the first.

Dependence on other Pauline epistles is observable. Thus iv. 14 follows 1 Cor. v. 9, 11, the peculiar phraseology being the same. Compare also 1 Cor. iv. 14. *The Lord of peace* (iii. 16), is taken from 1 Cor. xiv. 33; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. In like manner, 2 Thess. ii. 2 is from Galat. i. 6; iii. 4 from Galat. v. 10; and iii. 13 from Galat. vi. 9.

The particulars just enumerated raise suspicions against the authenticity of the letter, though they have been met by apologetic arguments that blunt their edge. It cannot be denied that genuine Pauline ideas as well as expressions are found in it. If it was not written by the apostle himself, it proceeded from a disciple. Perhaps the greater part of the third chapter, with ii. 13—17, came from Paul, for the admonitions bear the impress of his mind. We may suppose that the second epistle was retouched, and enlarged with new matter, especially with ch. ii. 1–12, by a Pauline Christian. If this be so, it may be called authentic, *with modifications*. The purely Pauline basis has been wrought over, changed, and extended, the immediate occasion of which

lay in another politico-religious atmosphere than that which gave rise to the first. The figure of antichrist embodied in a person had emerged. Jerusalem was soon to be destroyed, its temple profaned by heathenism. The personal advent of Christ, which the Thessalonians enthusiastically expected, had spoiled their lives by its delay, leading to neglect of daily duties. The portrait presented in the Revelation introduced corrective traits and preluding events into that which had filled the minds of believers during the life of Paul. Hence the writer adapts the letter to the new circumstances, telling the Thessalonians that the day of the Lord is not imminent, and that they should go about their proper work with patience. He exhorts them to wait, and to endure their sufferings with faith, for the end is not yet. The date is about A.D. 69.

The second epistle has long been objected to on internal grounds. Schmidt led the way, and was followed by Kern,[1] whose arguments are still valid. Baur sharpened and enlarged them.[2] Hilgenfeld,[3] P. W. Schmidt,[4] Holtzmann,[5] Lipsius,[6] Weisse,[7] Van Manen,[8] Hausrath,[9] and Pfleiderer[10] assent. Noack[11] rejects both epistles, as do Van der Vries[12] and Volkmar.[13] But the second has had its defenders, Reiche, Hofmann, Lünemann, Reuss, Jowett, and others, who are more successful in vindicating its Pauline authorship on the ground of other parts than the paragraph relating to antichrist.[14]

[1] In the *Tübingen Zeitschrift* for 1839, Heft ii.
[2] *Paulus der Apostel, u. s. w.*, p. 480, etc.
[3] *Zeitschrift*, vol. v. p. 225, etc.
[4] *Protestanten Bibel*, p. 821, etc.
[5] In Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, vol. v. p. 501, etc.
[6] *Studien und Kritiken* for 1854, p. 905, etc.
[7] *Philosophische Dogmatik*, vol. i. p. 146.
[8] *De Echtheid van Paulus brieven aan de Thessalonicensen*, 1865.
[9] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. ii. p. 600.
[10] *Paulinismus*, vol. i. p. 29, English translation.
[11] *Ursprung des Christenthums*, vol. ii. p. 313, etc.
[12] *De beiden brieven aan de Thessalonicensen*, 1865.
[13] *Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt*, p. 114, etc.
[14] Canon Farrar says he has 'carefully studied' the arguments of Baur,

## COMPARISON OF THE THESSALONIAN EPISTLES WITH THE ACTS.

It is not easy to bring the epistles into exact correspondence with the Acts of the Apostles, neither is it important. The history of the latter may be supplemented and corrected by the notices of the former.

1. The Thessalonian Christians are represented as Gentiles who had turned from idolatry. The church was therefore of heathen origin. In the Acts xvii. 4, we read that some of the Jews believed, and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few, language implying that Jewish proselytes and Jews formed the body of the church, even if the women were Gentiles, which we do not know. This discrepancy can only be removed by supposing the narrative in the Acts inexact. Incomplete knowledge on the part of the historian will not account for it. The difficulty is obviated by the reading in the Acts which inserts *and* before *Greeks* ('both of the devout *and* of the Greeks a great multitude'), but it is feebly supported, though Lachmann adopts it. The MSS. A. and D. cannot outweigh B. and ℵ.

2. The persecutors of the Thessalonians were their fellow-countrymen, *i.e* Gentiles (1 ep. ii. 14), whereas in the Acts Jews were the active adversaries. The discrepancy cannot be removed or lessened by assuming that 'fellow-countrymen' might include many Hellenist Jews. It can only and properly mean pagans. Paley's solution, that though the opposition made to the gospel originated in the enmity of the Jews, the Gentiles carried it out, is not satisfactory though approved by De Wette.

Kern, Van der Vaier, De Wette, Volkmar, Zeller, and the Tübingen school generally, which are 'so slight as to be scarcely deserving of serious refutation.' But De Wette maintained the authenticity of both epistles in all editions of his Introduction to the New Testament after the first and second. Van der Vaier is a Dutchman framed out of the Canon's imagination.

3. The notices of Silas and Timothy in the Acts and the epistles are discordant.

In the Acts, Paul and Silas are together at Thessalonica, and were sent away by night to Berœa. No mention is made there of Timothy. From Berœa the apostle went to Athens; but Timothy and Silas remained. Those who conducted him to Athens carried back orders that the two companions should join him there. Nothing is said, however, about their going thither; nor do they reappear with the apostle till he is at Corinth, to which place they came from Macedonia (Acts xviii. 5).

The epistles inform us that Timothy and Silas were with Paul when he wrote (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1). The first intimates that Paul thought it best to be left alone at Athens, and sent Timothy to Thessalonica. The *we* before 'thought it good' means himself alone, not himself and Silas. Timothy returned with good news.

It is not easy to harmonise these accounts except by assumptions. Thus it has been thought that Timothy, who had been left behind at Thessalonica, followed Paul and Silas to Berœa, and that he was sent back thence with the first letter. Paul went on to Athens, leaving Silas and Timothy at Berœa; but though both had orders to follow him speedily to Athens, they were countermanded. The Acts do not favour the idea of Timothy's following the apostle to Athens; for it is said that he and Silas were merely *expected* there, not that they actually came; but the words of the first epistle at the beginning of the third chapter imply that Timothy when at Athens was sent back to Thessalonica.

The order of the epistles need not be discussed if the authenticity of the second be abandoned; for it concerns those only who hold both to be Pauline. Grotius thought that the second or shorter was written first;

and others have entertained the same opinion. The arguments in favour of it are of some weight, as stated by Ewald and Baur. Those who maintain the full authenticity of the second, have difficulty in doing so and conserving the traditional order at the same time.

# INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON THE GOSPELS.

## MUTUAL RELATION.

THOSE who compare the first three gospels cannot fail to perceive that they agree not only in the substance of what they relate but often in the diction itself. Amid minor diversities they harmonise with one another in contents. Numerous investigations have been made to explain the resemblances.

The following hypotheses have been proposed to account for them.

1. That the gospels were derived from a common written source or sources.

2. That they were derived from oral tradition which had assumed a fixed form.

3. That earlier gospels were used in the composition of the later.

4. Some have combined the last two opinions, making a composite view out of them.

It would be a waste of time to discuss these opinions at length. We can only indicate what is settled among the best critics.

The first view has passed away, notwithstanding the amount of ingenuity expended in developing it by Eichhorn[1] and Marsh. It is clumsy, laboured, and inadequate.

The second is also obsolete, in spite of Gieseler's

[1] *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, vol. i.

able explanation.[1] Though it accounts for many resemblances and discordances in the gospels, it fails to explain their numerous verbal coincidences. The fixed form which it requires for the oral gospel must involve peculiar verbal agreements which would not be stereotyped. It does not meet the case, to say that the Jews preserved the sayings of their great teachers with strict accuracy; for the circle of hearers in which the oral gospel is supposed to have been formed was wider, more miscellaneous, less intellectual than the class that treasured up the sayings of the Jewish rabbis, not to speak of the manifoldness of the sayings of Jesus compared with the more easily retained and concise dicta of the former. Besides, the Jews did not rely on memory alone, but wrote down even in that age what they valued most.

The third hypothesis is the only tenable one. We should not say that the evangelists 'recommended each other,' as Dr. H. Owen affirms; nor is it a sufficient answer to the objection, 'how came they not to avoid the many contradictions observable among them,' that these are only *seeming* contradictions, which would disappear were we fully acquainted with all the facts and circumstances. The evangelists used one another freely, having ulterior sources written and oral, which they employed according to the purpose that guided selection. It was not their intention to sift the documents at their disposal, to copy them literally, or to adhere to them slavishly Their scope was wider, following no exact rule; and their passing from one source to another should not be judged by a modern standard. A leading motive usually guided their procedure, and shaped the character of the narratives from whatever source they were drawn. Indifferent about perfect agreement, the avoidance of contradictions did not

[1] *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien*, 1818.

disturb them: they were intent on more important things. Those who think they refute our view by putting into juxta-position passages which agree verbally, diverge, return to verbal coincidence and so on, assume that they prove absurdity in a writer who, after taking a few words from his predecessor, gives a few that vary either because they come from another document or because of his own caprice, so that predecessors are used alternately in an interlacing fashion. But this is a caricature of the view, making the evangelists mechanical copyists, and leaving out of account the employment of additional documents, conscious freedom in dealing as well with the matter as the manner of each other's compositions, and especially the processes through which the gospels passed before they reached their present state under the hands of redactors. The synoptics as they now are, show the result, not the progress, of mutual derivation.

Those who believe in the original independence of the evangelists—that each wrote without seeing his predecessor's work—have been fairly driven out of the field of criticism. One valid argument overthrows their belief, viz. the peculiar resemblance of Mark's gospel to that of Matthew. It is easy to allege that on the ground of one evangelist following another, no good reason can be given why each has here and there something peculiar to himself; why he occasionally speaks more definitely than another, more circumstantially, more chronologically, or more briefly. It is also easy to assert, that no good reason can be given why the diction of one should be altered by his successor for the worse, or changed without improvement, or rendered obscurer. Difficulties innumerable may be raised with respect to the abridging and adding processes of a later evangelist. Why did he act so and so, and not in a certain way suggested?

The question can be brought to a probable issue in one way only; that is, by carefully examining and

comparing the gospels as we have them. What do the phenomena themselves suggest? Is the similarity in all cases of a nature to exclude the partial dependence of one writer on another? Notwithstanding discrepancies in matter and manner which intersect resemblances—diversities interlacing the agreements in every variety—the evidence is sufficient to show that the authors were not independent of one another.

We rely on the coincidences between Mark and Matthew alone to prove that the former used the latter.

It is less clear that Mark employed Matthew and Luke; or that Luke followed Matthew and Mark. The priority of Luke to Mark is the more probable; and therefore that Mark used the gospels of his two predecessors. To reconcile contradictions with the view now taken is not difficult, if the individuality of the writers be allowed fair scope by the side of varying documents and oral tradition.

The canonical gospels were composed out of written materials chiefly. Earlier documents, which afterwards disappeared, preceded and contributed to each. This applies not only to the first but to the second and third. But oral tradition must not be excluded; though it formed a small element in the composition of each, because much of it had been incorporated into written collections when the canonical gospels appeared.

It is satisfactory to perceive that good critics have ceased to regard harmonies, both Greek and English. Whatever use such works may have had once, their day is past. Laboured attempts to put every part of the gospels into its right chronological place by transpositions, assumptions, violent distortions, so as to make a consistent and successive narrative out of all, are useless. It is painful to see the efforts of their authors to remove contradictions, and to explain in a conciliatory spirit portions that are really intractable. While credit is due to Greswell and Robinson, the two ablest harmonists,

for their attempts to construct works of this nature, their failure is apparent. As long as *plenary* inspiration is attributed to the evangelists, it is the interest of its advocates to find pervading unity in the four gospels —an unity inconsistent with positive or real discrepancies. Those who decry harmonies while advocating plenary inspiration are inconsistent. Though they see that harmonists fail in many places, they do not help them to work out what is in the interests of their own belief. Their duty is to aid harmonising essays to the utmost, and not to take refuge in ignorance of all the circumstances of the case. It is timid policy to say, when a real contradiction stares the interpreter in the face, 'This could be satisfactorily cleared up, did we know all the circumstances.' What is it but saying in effect, 'I have a shorter way of getting out of the difficulties than the harmonists ? I admit the present inexplicability of passages, but hold that they are perfectly consistent if more light were thrown upon the circumstances, because inspiration excludes the contradiction of Scripture with itself. Perhaps also the text is corrupt ; it should be altered, even against authority.'

The true corrective of harmonies is an honest explanation of the gospels as the best textual criticism presents them. By fair exegesis, ingenious hypotheses of 'plenary' or 'dynamical' inspiration—an inspiration combining the two elements of the human and divine in perfection—appear at once as the inventions of apologists building imaginary castles without proper regard to the materials. The castles are built first ; and the stones are afterwards shaped with great labour, or with a capricious readiness that forces them into unsuitable positions. The four copies of the title on the cross are sufficient to overthrow the flimsy fabrics.

The harmony subsisting between the first three gospels in matter and manner may be seen in the following sections and passages.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Matt. iii. 1–12. | Mark i. 2–8. | Luke iii. 1–18. |
| 2. | „ iii. 13–17. | „ i. 9–11. | „ iii. 21, 22. |
| 3. | „ iv. 1–11. | „ i. 12, 13. | „ iv. 1–13. |
| 4. | „ iv. 12–17. | „ i. 14, 15. | „ iv. 14, 15. |
| 5. | „ iv. 18–22. | „ i. 16–20. | „ v. 1–11. |
| 6. | „ v. 15. | „ iv. 21. | „ viii. 16, & xi. 33. |
| 7. | „ viii. 2–4. | „ i. 40–45. | „ v. 12–16. |
| 8. | „ viii. 14–17. | „ i. 29–34. | „ iv. 38–41. |
| 9. | „ viii. 23–27. | „ iv. 36–41. | „ viii. 22–25. |
| 10. | „ viii. 28–34. | „ v. 1–20. | „ viii. 26–39. |
| 11. | „ ix. 1–8. | „ ii. 1–12. | „ v. 17–26. |
| 12. | „ ix. 9. | „ ii. 13, 14. | „ v. 27, 28. |
| 13. | „ ix. 10–17. | „ ii. 15–22. | „ v. 29–39. |
| 14. | „ ix. 18–26. | „ v. 22–43. | „ viii. 41–56. |
| 15. | „ x. 1. | „ vi. 7. | „ ix. 1. |
| 16. | „ x. 2–4. | „ iii. 16–19. | „ vi. 13–16. |
| 17. | „ x. 5–14. | „ vi. 8–11. | „ ix. 2–5 |
| 18. | „ xii. 1–8. | „ ii. 23–28. | „ vi. 1–5. |
| 19. | „ xii. 9–14. | „ iii. 1–6. | „ vi. 6–11. |
| 20. | „ xii. 22–30. | „ iii. 22–27. | „ xi. 14–23. |
| 21. | „ xii. 46–50. | „ iii. 31–35. | „ viii. 19–21. |
| 22. | „ xiii. 1–23. | „ iv. 1–25. | „ viii. 4–15. |
| 23. | „ xiv. 1, 2. | „ vi. 14, 15. | „ ix. 7, 8. |
| 24. | „ xiv. 3, 4. | „ vi. 17, 18. | „ iii. 19, 20. |
| 25. | „ xiv. 13–21. | „ vi. 30–44. | „ ix. 10–17. |
| 26. | „ xvi. 13–28. | „ viii. 27–ix. 1. | „ ix. 18–27. |
| 27. | „ xvii. 1–8. | „ ix. 2–8. | „ ix. 28–36. |
| 28. | „ xvii. 14–18. | „ ix. 14–27. | „ ix. 37–43. |
| 29. | „ xvii. 22, 23. | „ ix. 30–32. | „ ix. 43–45. |
| 30. | „ xviii. 1–5. | „ ix. 33–41. | „ ix. 46–50. |
| 31. | „ xix. 13–15. | „ x. 13–16. | „ xviii. 15–17. |
| 32. | „ xix. 16–30. | „ x. 17–31. | „ xviii. 18–30. |
| 33. | „ xx. 17–19. | „ x. 32–34. | „ xviii. 31–34. |
| 34. | „ xx. 29–34. | „ x. 46–52. | „ xviii. 35–43. |
| 35. | „ xxi. 1–9. | „ xi. 1–10. | „ xix. 29–38. |
| 36. | „ xxi. 12, 13. | „ xi. 15–17. | „ xix. 45, 46. |
| 37. | „ xxi. 23–27. | „ xi. 27–33. | „ xx. 1–8. |
| 38. | „ xxi. 33–46. | „ xii. 1–12. | „ xx. 9–19. |
| 39. | „ xxii. 15–22. | „ xii. 13–17. | „ xx. 20–26. |
| 40. | „ xxii. 23–33. | „ xii. 18–27. | „ xx. 27–40. |
| 41. | „ xxii. 41–46. | „ xii. 35–37. | „ xx. 41–44. |
| 42. | „ xxiii. 1–14. | „ xii. 38–40. | „ xx. 45–47. |
| 43. | „ xxiv. 1–36. | „ xiii. 1–32. | „ xxi. 5–33. |
| 44. | „ xxvi. 1–5. | „ xiv. 1, 2. | „ xxii. 1, 2. |
| 45. | „ xxvi. 14–16. | „ xiv. 10, 11. | „ xxii. 3–6. |
| 46. | „ xxvi. 17–29. | „ xiv. 12–25. | „ xxii. 7–23. |
| 47. | „ xxvi. 36–56. | „ xiv. 32–52. | „ xxii. 40–53. |
| 48. | „ xxvi. 57, 58. | „ xiv. 53, 54. | „ xxii. 54, 55. |
| 49. | „ xxvi. 69–75. | „ xiv. 66–72. | „ xxii. 56–71. |
| 50. | „ xxvii. 1, 2. | „ xv. 1. | „ xxiii. 1. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 51. | Matt. xxvii. 11, 23. | Mark xv. 2–14. | Luke xxiii. 2–23. |
| 52. | „ xxvii. 26. | „ xv. 15. | „ xxiii. 24, 25. |
| 53. | „ xxvii. 32. | „ xv. 21. | „ xxiii. 26. |
| 54. | „ xxvii. 33. | „ xv. 22. | „ xxiii. 33. |
| 55. | „ xxvii. 34–38. | „ xv. 24–28. | „ xxiii. 33, 34, 38. |
| 56. | „ xxvii. 39–56. | „ xv. 29–41. | „ xxiii. 35–49. |
| 57. | „ xxvii. 57–61. | „ xv. 42–47. | „ xxiii. 50–56. |
| 58. | „ xxviii. 1–8. | „ xvi. 1–8. | „ xxiv. 1–9. |

The parallels now given from the three gospels will not appear the same in different lists, in consequence of the different views entertained of the principles that should underlie a harmony, and diversities of judgment as to the mode of carrying out those principles. Hence the tables furnished by critics differ.

Again, while the matter constituting the body of the three gospels is similar, there is great diversity in its arrangement. Exact chronological sequence is not in any of the writers. Matthew comes nearest it. In the arrangement of facts, Mark agrees more nearly with Luke than Matthew and is farther from the true order.

There are sections common to two evangelists only, of which the following are all the cases possible.

(*a.*) Sections and places common to Matthew and Mark :—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Matthew.—x. 42. | Mark.—ix. 41. |
| 2. | „ xiii. 34, 35. | „ iv. 33, 34. |
| 3. | „ xiii. 54–58. | „ vi. 2–6. |
| 4. | „ xiv. 6–12. | „ vi. 21–29. |
| 5. | „ xiv. 22, 23. | „ vi. 45, 46. |
| 6. | „ xiv. 28–36. | „ vi. 50–56. |
| 7. | „ xv. 1–20. | „ vii. 1–23. |
| 8. | „ xv. 21–29. | „ vii. 24–31. |
| 9. | „ xv. 30–39. | „ viii. 1–10. |
| 10. | „ xvi. 1–4. | „ viii. 11–13. |
| 11. | „ xvi. 5–12. | „ viii. 14–21. |
| 12. | „ xvii. 9–13. | „ ix. 9–13. |
| 13. | „ xvii. 19–21. | „ ix. 28, 29. |
| 14. | „ xviii. 6–9. | „ ix. 42–48. |
| 15. | „ xix. 1–9. | „ x. 1–12. |
| 16. | „ xx. 20–28. | „ x. 35–45. |
| 17. | „ xxi. 17–22. | „ xi. 11–14, 19–26. |
| 18. | „ xxii. 34–40. | „ xii. 28–34. |
| 19. | „ xxiv. 22–26. | „ xiii. 20–23. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 20. | Matthew.—xxvi. 6–13. | Mark.—xiv. 3–9. |
| 21. | „ xxvi. 42–46, 48. | „ xiv. 39–42, 44. |
| 22. | „ xxvi. 59–68. | „ xiv. 55–65. |
| 23. | „ xxvii. 15–18. | „ xv. 6–10. |
| 24. | „ xxvii. 27–31. | „ xv. 16–20. |
| 25. | „ xxvii. 46–49. | „ xv. 34–36. |
| 26. | „ xxviii. 7. | „ xvi. 7. |

(*b.*) Passages found in Mark and Luke only :—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Mark.—i. 21–28. | Luke.—iv. 31–37. |
| 2. | „ i. 35–39. | „ iv. 42–44. |
| 3. | „ i. 45. | „ v. 15, 16. |
| 4. | „ ii. 4. | „ v. 19. |
| 5. | „ iii. 13–15. | „ vi. 12, 13. |
| 6. | „ iv. 21–25. | „ viii. 16–18. |
| 7. | „ v. 4. | „ viii. 27. |
| 8. | „ v. 9, 10. | „ viii. 30, 31. |
| 9. | „ v. 29–33. | „ viii. 45–47. |
| 10. | „ v. 35–37. | „ viii. 48–51. |
| 11. | „ vi. 15, 16. | „ ix. 8, 9. |
| 12. | „ vi. 30, 31. | „ ix. 10. |
| 13. | „ viii. 38. | „ ix. 26. |
| 14. | „ ix. 38–40. | „ ix. 49, 50. |
| 15. | „ xi. 18. | „ xix. 47, 48. |
| 16. | „ xii. 41–44. | „ xxi. 1–4. |
| 17. | „ xiii. 9, 11. | „ xxi. 12–15. |

(*c.*) Parallel passages found in Matthew and Luke only :—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Matthew.—iv. 3–11. | Luke.—iv. 3–13. |
| 2. | „ v. 1–12. | „ vi. 20–23. |
| 3. | „ v. 39–48. | „ vi. 27–36 |
| 4. | „ v. 18. | „ xvi. 17. |
| 5. | „ v. 25, 26. | „ xii. 58, 59. |
| 6. | „ vi. 7–13. | „ xi. 1–4. |
| 7. | „ vi. 19–21. | „ xii. 33, 34. |
| 8. | „ vi. 22, 23. | „ xi. 34–36. |
| 9. | „ vi. 24. | „ xvi. 13. |
| 10. | „ vi. 25–33. | „ xii. 22–31. |
| 11. | „ vii. 1, 2, 3–5, 12, [16–20, 24–27. | „ vi. 31, 37, 38, 41, 42, [44–49. |
| 12. | „ viii. 5–13. | „ vii. 1–10. |
| 13. | „ viii. 19–22. | „ ix. 57–60. |
| 14. | „ ix. 37, 38. | „ x. 2. |
| 15. | „ x. 12, 13. | „ x. 5, 6. |
| 16. | „ x. 15. | „ x. 12. |
| 17. | „ x. 16. | „ x. 3. |
| 18. | „ x. 19, 20. | „ xii. 11, 12. |
| 19. | „ x. 24. | „ vi. 40. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 20. | Matthew.—x. 26–33. | Luke.—xii. 2–9. |
| 21. | „ x. 34, 35. | „ xii. 51–53. |
| 22. | „ xi. 2–19. | „ vii. 18–35. |
| 23. | „ xi. 21–23. | „ x. 13–15. |
| 24. | „ xi. 25–27. | „ x. 21, 22. |
| 25. | „ xii. 23. | „ xi. 14. |
| 26. | „ xii. 38–42. | „ xi. 16, 29–31. |
| 27. | „ xii. 43–45. | „ xi. 24–26. |
| 28. | „ xiii. 33. | „ xiii. 20, 21. |
| 29. | „ xviii. 12–14. | „ xv. 4–7. |
| 30. | „ xxiii. 37–39. | „ xiii. 34, 35. |
| 31. | „ xxiv. 45–51. | „ xii. 42–48. |
| 32. | „ xxv. 14–30. | „ xix. 11–28. |

For *verbal correspondences* in three gospels, the following passages, selected from those just given, may serve :—

| Matt.—iii. 3. | Mark.—i. 3. | Luke.—iii. 4. |
|---|---|---|
| „ iii. 11. | „ i. 7. | „ iii. 16. |
| „ viii. 2–4. | „ i. 40–44. | „ v. 12–14. |
| „ viii. 15. | „ i. 31. | „ iv. 39. |
| „ ix. 2, 4–6. | „ ii. 5, 8–10. | „ v. 20, 22–24. |
| „ ix. 15. | „ ii. 20. | „ v. 35. |
| „ ix. 22. | „ v. 34. | „ viii. 48. |
| „ ix. 24. | „ v. 39. | „ viii. 52. |
| „ xii. 13. | „ iii. 5. | „ vi. 10. |
| „ xiv. 19, 20. | „ vi. 41–43. | „ ix. 16, 17. |
| „ xvi. 21. | „ vii. 31. | „ ix. 22. |
| „ xvi. 24–26. | „ viii. 34–37. | „ ix. 23–25. |
| „ xvi. 28. | „ ix. 1. | „ ix. 27. |
| „ xvii. 5. | „ ix. 7. | „ ix. 35. |
| „ xvii. 17. | „ ix. 19. | „ ix. 41. |
| „ xix. 29. | „ x. 29. | „ xviii. 29. |
| „ xxi. 12, 13. | „ xi. 15, 17. | „ xix. 45, 46. |
| „ xxi. 23. | „ xi. 28. | „ xx. 2. |
| „ xxi. 25–27. | „ xi. 30–33. | „ xx. 4, 5, 6, 8. |
| „ xxi. 42. | „ xii. 10. | „ xx. 17. |
| „ xxii. 44. | „ xii. 36. | „ xx. 42, 43. |
| „ xxiv. 6–9. | „ xiii. 7–13. | „ xxi. 9–17. |
| „ xxiv. 19. | „ xiii. 17. | „ xxi. 23. |
| „ xxiv. 30. | „ xiii. 26. | „ xxi. 27. |
| „ xxiv. 35. | „ xiii. 31. | „ xxi. 33. |
| „ xxvi. 29. | „ xiv. 25. | „ xxii. 18. |

Other verbal coincidences in the parallel sections and passages of the three gospels may be discovered besides the present. There are some very striking examples in such coincident passages, of verbal agreement between

two of the evangelists, the third relating the same things in different words. None of these, however, has been adduced, because our object is to select verbal coincidences between the three writers *in sections or passages common to all.* The verbal coincidences between two gospels alone are more frequent and striking. Take the following specimens in sections or passages common to two evangelists :—

| | |
|---|---|
| Matthew.—xiv. 22, 34. | Mark.—vi. 45, 53. |
| „ xv. 7–10. | „ vii. 6, 7, 14. |
| „ xv. 26, 32. | „ vii. 27; viii. 1, 2. |
| „ xix. 5, 6. | „ x. 7–9. |
| „ xx. 22–28. | „ x. 38–45. |
| „ xxiv. 22. | „ xiii. 20. |
| Mark.—i. 24, 25. | Luke.—iv. 34, 35. |
| „ viii. 38. | „ ix. 26. |
| „ ix. 38, 40. | „ ix. 49, 50. |
| Matthew.—v. 44. | Luke.—vi. 27, 28. |
| „ vii. 5. | „ vi. 42. |
| „ viii. 8–10. | „ vii. 6–9. |
| „ viii. 20, 22. | „ ix. 58, 60. |
| „ xi. 3–11. | „ vii. 19–28. |
| „ xi. 16–19. | „ vii. 31–35. |
| „ xii. 41–45. | „ xi. 24–26, 31, 32. |
| „ xiii. 33. | „ xiii. 20, 21. |
| „ xxiii. 37, 38. | „ xiii. 34, 35. |
| „ xxiv. 46–50. | „ xii. 43–46. |

Bishop Marsh pointed out the following phenomena connected with the verbal agreement of the gospels.

1. The examples in which all three gospels verbally coincide are not very numerous; and contain, in general, only one or two, or at most three sentences together.

2. The examples of verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark are very numerous.

3. The examples of verbal agreement between Mark and Luke are not numerous, being but eight in all.[1]

4. The verbal coincidences are more numerous in reciting the words of Jesus, and in the reports of words spoken by others in connection with His language, than

[1] Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii. p. 378, etc.

in the narrative parts. This is admitted by Marsh, whose peculiar hypothesis does not account for it satisfactorily.[1] Where the evangelists speak in their own person, verbal agreement can scarcely be termed rare, as it is by Norton. It appears, at least, to such an extent in the narrative parts of Mark as to show that the mind of the evangelist, imbued with the sentiments and language of Matthew, led him naturally into his predecessor's ideas and expressions.

If the synoptic text be divided into 124 sections, as it is by Reuss, forty-seven of them are common to the three. Twelve are in Matthew and Mark, two in Matthew and Luke, six in Mark and Luke. Seventeen are in Matthew alone, two in Mark, and thirty-eight in Luke alone.

5. It should also be observed, that the passages in which the words of others are repeated, bear a small proportion to the narrative parts. If, for example, the gospels be separated into two divisions, the one consisting of the recital of others' words, the second of the evangelists' statements of facts, the extent of the latter will be much greater than that of the former. Mr. Norton, who carefully examined this subject, found the proportion of verbal coincidence in the narrative part of Matthew, compared with what exists in the other part, to be as one to more than two; in Mark, as one to four; and in Luke as one to ten.[2]

6. Verbal coincidences are also found in predictions from the Old Testament, though much seldomer than in the case just mentioned. This may be owing to the common use of the Septuagint version.

As long as every part of the gospels is considered historical, no advance can be made toward ascertaining

[1] An illustration of the hypothesis proposed in the dissertation on the origin and composition of our three first canonical gospels.

[2] *The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. cii; additional notes.

their genetic origin or true characteristics. If they be assigned to the writers whose names they bear, internal evidence disproves it; for it is plain that unhistorical materials are incorporated, the gradual growth of more than one generation after the apostles. When it is also affirmed by Norton, that 'the Christians of the first two centuries had as great reverence for the sacred books of our religion as Christians of the present day,' the statement is unfounded. Certain it is, that Papias did not look upon them as canonical or authoritative, for he says, 'I did not think that things out of books profited me as much as those of the living and abiding voice,'[1] implying that he set as high if not a higher value on oral tradition in regard to the evangelical history as he did upon the gospels with which he was acquainted. So too Hegesippus (A.D. 170) places the orthodoxy of the Church in its attachment to the law, the prophets, and the Lord, without allusion to a standard of apostolic writings.[2] It is also incorrect to assert, that Justin regarded the gospels as entitled to equal reverence with the Jewish Scriptures. In quoting from the writings of apostles he never uses the phrases common in relation to the Old Testament, 'the Spirit says,' 'God speaks through them.' It was not till towards the close of the second century, that the catholic Christians began to feel the necessity of elevating the four gospels which had attained general currency, to the dignity and authority of canonicity, and attributing to them a value already accorded to the Old Testament. Before A.D. 160 there is no proof that Christians generally had great reverence for the first three gospels, or for the productions by which they were preceded and by whose aid they were written.

The narratives consist of the real and the ideal—the historical and mythic. No critic will deny that the time between the occurrences and the present gospels

[1] Apud Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 39. [2] *Ibid.* iv. 22.

was sufficient to allow of the growth of legends and the moulding power of fancy in connection with the original facts; so that the real events and sayings are presented in forms more or less exaggerated, distorted, unreal; or are buried beneath later creations. A mythic haze encompasses the person, life, and discourses of Jesus; and sober criticism must set about the task of removing it reverently, respecting tradition without superstitiously adopting it. After this is done, there stands forth in colours more or less distinct, a person such as the world never saw before—the living type of an ideal humanity, pure and perfect, destined to influence all times, to purify all people among whom His name is known, and to ennoble His followers by lifting them up to the measure of His stature.

Tradition is the mother of fable. By admitting a traditional source of the gospel wholly or in part, its historical inaccuracy is allowed. If indeed the tradition existed only during the life of its authors, if it was fixed in writing before the first witnesses passed away, little time is left for mythic embellishment. But that position is critically untenable. External evidence does not prove it, and internal is adverse. Had we even the memoirs which Mark is said to have written down from Peter, or Matthew's Aramaic discourses, it is probable that the moulding influence of oral tradition would appear in them; how much more in the present synoptics, which are the growth of successive recensions, the embodiment of varying traditions, Galilean and Judaic, apostolic and postapostolic.

# THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

## ALLEGED WRITER.

MATTHEW and Levi may have been different persons, though it is more probable that they were the same. The circumstances related by Mark and Luke respecting the call of Levi are so like those connected with the call of Matthew, that identity of person may be assumed. Perhaps after embracing Christianity and changing his mode of life, the apostle adopted a new name. Matthew, the son of Alphæus, a native of Galilee, was summoned from his employment of publican at Capernaum to be a disciple of Jesus. Few particulars of his life are recorded. It is said that he left Palestine to preach the gospel in other countries, in Arabia Felix for example, part of which was called Ethiopia, and where there were many Jews. His ascetic manner of life noticed by Clement of Alexandria, rests on an apocryphal foundation; and the accounts of his death are uncertain. According to Heracleon he died a natural death; but whether in Ethiopia, as Socrates affirms, or in Macedonia, according to Isidore of Seville, it is impossible to ascertain. The statement of Nicephorus that he suffered martyrdom is less probable.

## THE PERSONS FOR WHOM THE GOSPEL WAS INTENDED.

It was universally believed in ancient times, that the first gospel was intended for the use of Jewish Chris-

tians. The fact is affirmed by Irenæus, Eusebius, Jerome, and others; and internal evidence favours it. The original writer presupposes an acquaintance on the part of his readers with Judea, its geography, natural productions and local phenomena, which could only have been expected of Jews. They had the temple before their eyes, with its sacrificial arrangements. They were familiar with the customs of the Hebrews, and are supposed to know the Mosaic law. The contents of the gospel, especially its citations from the Old Testament with their introductory formulas, attest the truth of our statement. Thus the evangelist writes that the institutions of the law and the prophetic writings were significant of things future till John appeared, with whom their fulfilment began (xi. 13–15).

### THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE IN WHICH MATTHEW WROTE.

Ancient testimony is unanimous in declaring that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, i.e. Aramæan or Syro-Chaldaic, the vernacular tongue of the Jews in Palestine at the time of Christ.

Papias of Hierapolis, a hearer of John the elder, according to Eusebius, wrote a work entitled 'An Exposition of Oracles of the Lord;'[1] and extracts from it are preserved chiefly by Irenæus and Eusebius, which are valuable at the present day. The following one from its preface, is in Eusebius: 'But I will not scruple also to put along with my interpretations for your benefit whatsoever in time past I learned well from the elders and remembered well, guaranteeing their truth. For I did not, like the many, take pleasure in those who say much, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who record foreign commandments, but such as were given from the Lord to the faith, and are derived from the truth itself. But if any one came

[1] λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις.

in my way who had been a follower of the elders, I inquired about the discourses of the elders—what was said by Andrew, Peter or Philip, or by Thomas, James, John, Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples; and what Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that I could get so much profit from *books* as from a living and abiding voice.' Again: 'Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able.'[1]

Was Papias a credible witness? Eusebius states concerning him, 'He appears to have been of very weak understanding.'[2] This judgment rested on the fact that Papias understood certain parables of our Lord too literally, and entertained millennarian opinions, to which the historian was strongly opposed. Slender abilities do not vitiate the credibility of a witness, if he possess integrity of character. When Eusebius says of Papias elsewhere, 'a man most eloquent in every respect and skilled in Scripture,'[3] the words are probably spurious, since they are not in the St. Petersburg Syriac copy dated A.D. 462, nor in several Greek MSS. specified by Schwegler. Papias has given the source whence he derived his information respecting Matthew. It was John the elder; for after the historian introduces a quotation from Papias relative to Mark and his gospel, beginning with 'and the presbyter said this,' he subjoins, 'such is the account of Papias respecting Mark.' And of Matthew it has been said, 'Matthew composed,' etc. It is scarcely probable that Eusebius would have written, 'these things have been said of Matthew,'[4] had not the information given in the quotation from Papias immediately following been drawn from the same source with that contained in the preceding quotation.

[1] *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.*—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39.

[2] *σφόδρα . . . . σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν . . . . φαίνεται.*

[3] *ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων.*

[4] *περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται.*

The passage quoted above shows that Papias's work was an exposition or interpretation of the *Lord's oracles*; that he carefully collected oral traditions illustrative of his exposition, and that the elders who had come in contact with apostles were the principal source of those traditions. The main point is, the meaning of the *Lord's oracles*. Were they our written gospels, the canonical gospels of the present day? To show that they were, examples have been adduced from the New Testament in proof that *oracles* is equivalent to *scriptures*. But such instances are of no account in the present case, because most of them refer to the Old Testament; which is not the point in question. Nor is the application of the title to the New Testament by writers belonging to the end of the second century and onwards of force, because the canonisation of the New Testament books was not made till the second half of the second century. The word *logia* was not employed till then as a synonym for Scripture. Hence the citation of passages from Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Basil are irrelevant.[1] It is true that the epistle of Polycarp uses the expression 'oracles of the Lord;' but his sense of it is uncertain and the authenticity of the epistle more than doubtful. Barnabas, however, is cited as a valid proof for the opinion that a gospel like Matthew's could be quoted as scripture by Papias, because his epistle introduces a quotation from Matthew's gospel by the formula *as it is written*; and if it could be quoted as scripture by Barnabas, it could surely be described as 'oracles' when Papias wrote. In answer to this we observe, that the quotation in Barnabas was probably taken from 4 Esdras viii. 3. As we have said elsewhere, even if the writer took the words from Matthew's gospel, it is possible that he used 'it is written' with reference to their prototype in the Old Testament. Of such inter-

[1] Bishop Lightfoot, in *Contemp. Review*, vol. xxvi. pp. 400, 401.

changes examples occur in writers of the second century; and it is the more probable that this is one from the fact that the author of 4 Esdras is elsewhere considered a prophet and referred to in the same way as Ezekiel. Barnabas's citation of a gospel as canonical is wholly improbable, since even Justin, thirty years after, never quotes the New Testament writings as *scripture*. The thing would be anomalous and opposed to the history of the first half of the second century.[1] If this be deemed unsatisfactory, the authoritative phrase, *as it is written*, probably belonged at first to a collection of Christ's sayings, of which several preceded the present gospels; and was transferred thence to the gospels themselves. Thus the proof of 'the Lord's oracles' in Papias as synonymous with Matthew's gospel, or of it along with other canonical ones, is without validity.

What then were 'the oracles of the Lord?' According to Schleiermacher, the phrase, 'the oracles,'[2] denotes a collection of our Lord's *remarkable sayings* written in Hebrew, which were subsequently extended and explained by the addition of facts and circumstances belonging to time and place. The context of the passage in Eusebius shows this restriction of the word to the *discourses* of Christ and the explanation of ἡρμήνευσε[3] to be incorrect. In speaking of Mark's gospel it is said that the evangelist did not write in regular *order*[4] the things which were either spoken or done by Christ; to which it is immediately subjoined, that Peter gave Mark such instruction as was necessary, but not a connected history of our Lord's oracles. Here 'the Lord's oracles,'[5] is explained by 'the things spoken or done by Christ,' both being used synonymously of the contents of Mark's gospel. On the other hand, the writer in speaking of Matthew says, 'He composed the oracles.'[6]

[1] *The Canon of the Bible*, pp. 121, 122, 3rd edition.
[2] τὰ λόγια.
[3] ἡρμήνευσε (explanation by enlargement).
[4] τάξει.
[5] τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια.
[6] τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. The συνεγράψατο refers to the σύνταξις pre-

Were these *oracles* written or oral? The former undoubtedly. They were collections of the Lord's sayings. His discourses would naturally be the first thing committed to writing by his disciples and followers, in whose eyes they had more value than his acts. These collections, which were necessarily imperfect and fragmentary, were used by the compilers of our present gospels in addition to oral tradition. When Papias tells us that Matthew wrote *the logia*, he means a work which contained the sayings and doings of Christ; and as the former predominated, the name took its origin from the principal part. But how did each one *transla'e*[1] the Aramæan *logia* of Matthew? The tense of the verb implies that the time was past when the Aramæan alone was current; and that one Greek translation had superseded the necessity of individual attempts. This version recognised by Papias had supplanted preceding recensions, so that it was no longer necessary to translate the Hebrew to the best of one's abilities. The testimony of Papias cannot be accepted as valid regarding the recognition of *our* Matthew in his own age, because it rests on the assumption that the recognised Greek translation of his time is identical with our canonical one. It is a bold step to make the Aramæan *logia* of Matthew into our present Greek gospel through a single authorised translation made in the days of Papias. Does the Greek Matthew present the characteristics of a translation? It should do so, if it were a direct version from the Aramæan; but it does not.[2] When Papias preferred the living voice to books, it

ceding; and τὰ λόγια also refers to λόγια κυριακά. Peter did not recite the contents of Mark's Gospel ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων. Matthew, on the contrary, Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο.

[1] ἡρμήνευσε.

[2] The new interpretation of the κυριακὰ λόγια proposed by Volkmar, cannot be accepted, notwithstanding the confidence with which it is advanced.—*Geschichtstreuen Theologie*, p. 47, and *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, pp. 61, 134.

is natural to suppose that the latter included 'the oracles of the Lord.' To say that they were not evangelical records, but only *works commenting on such records*, is an unwarrantable restriction of their range. The term *books* is general, pointing to all written records. We agree with the critics who take Papias's language to imply his preference of oral traditions, not only to written comments on the gospels, but to the *logia* themselves which he explained, and to which he added illustrations from oral sources.

The next witness is Irenæus who writes: 'Matthew among the Hebrews did also publish a gospel in writing, in their own language.'[1] It has been said that Irenæus adopted this opinion from Papias, and he may have done so. He had certainly a high respect for Papias, and followed him in holding the doctrine of the millennium. We do not know, however, whether he believed that Matthew wrote in Aramæan merely because Papias thought so.

The third witness is Pantænus, of whom Eusebius writes: 'Pantænus is also said to have gone to the Indians, where it is reported he found the gospel of Matthew, which had been delivered to some in that country who had the knowledge of Christ before his arrival: to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, is said to have preached, and to have left with them that writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters, and that it was preserved among them till the time in question.'[2] The words of Jerome about Pantænus are similar: 'Pantænus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, had preached in India the coming of our

[1] ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξηνέγκεν εὐαγγελίου, κ.τ.λ.—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 1.

[2] ὁ Πάνταινος καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς ἐλθεῖν λέγεται· ἔνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον παρά τισιν αὐτόθι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκόσιν· οἷς Βαρθολομαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἕνα κηρύξαι, αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφὴν, ἣν καὶ σώζεσθαι εἰς τὸν δηλούμενον χρόνον.—*H. E.* v. 10.

Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew which was written in Hebrew, and which also on his return to Alexandria he carried with him.'[1]

This testimony is important because it is independent of Papias. It is true that the account of Pantænus going to India was *a tradition*, since Eusebius introduces it as such ;[2] but the historian himself appears to have thought it correct. Even if it were but a *report* that Pantænus found the gospel of Matthew there, we are not at liberty to infer the falseness of it at once. As India means southern Arabia, the persons to whom Bartholomew preached were Jewish Christians unacquainted with Greek. Had Bartholomew made a version from the Greek, it would have been into Arabic. We infer therefore, that he took with him the Aramæan gospel of Matthew.

Eusebius gives Origen's testimony in these words : 'The first was written by Matthew, once a publican, afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language.'[3] According to Harless, this opinion must be resolved into that of Irenæus. But the most acute, and one of the most learned of the fathers, was not disposed to receive or adopt an opinion solely on Irenæus's credit. It is true that Eusebius gives Origen's words with the introduction, 'as I have understood from tradition ;' but that shows the prevalent belief of the age. The tradition which he adopted was general in his day.

Eusebius himself says : 'For Matthew having first

[1] 'Pantænus . . . . ubi [in India] reperit Bartholomæum de duodecim apostolis adventum domini nostri Jesus Christi juxta Matthæi evangelium prædicasse, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum revertens Alexandriam secum retulit.'—*De Viris Illustr.* c. 36.

[2] λέγεται.

[3] *πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ τελώνην, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον.*—*H. E.* vi. 25.

preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to other people, delivered to them in their own language the gospel according to him,' etc.[1]

This testimony is valuable, and can hardly be merged in that of Papias. If the historian was opposed to millennarianism, and had but a poor opinion of Papias's abilities, it is not probable that he would have followed him in believing Aramæan to be the original language of Matthew's gospel. Had he dissented from the current belief of the age, he would not have written as he does; for while he records, he often pronounces his own opinion. Hug affirms, that Eusebius gives a different view in another place. In his commentary on Psal. lxxviii. 2, we find the words, 'Instead of this "I will utter from the beginning," Matthew being a Hebrew, has used his own recension: "I will shout things hid from the foundation,"'[2] etc., which Hug interprets to mean, that Matthew, 'as one who was himself master of the Hebrew language, deserted the Septuagint rendering, and gave his own Greek translation,' implying that the apostle wrote in Greek. The term we have rendered *recension*[3] does indeed seem to mean *interpretation*; and therefore the writer is inconsistent with himself; but we need not expect consistency in the fathers. Eusebius forgot at the time the current tradition of the day and his own expressed opinion. That his real belief was given in his Ecclesiastical History, is confirmed by the fact that in another place[4] he ascribes a reading in Matthew xxviii. 1[5] to the *translator*, adding that the evan-

[1] Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.—*H. E.* iii. 24.

[2] ἀντὶ τοῦ φθέγξομαι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Ἑβραῖος ὢν ὁ Ματθαῖος οἰκείᾳ ἐκδόσει κέχρηται, εἰπών· ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.—Vol. v. pp. 904, 905, ed. Migne.

[3] ἔκδοσις.

[4] *Ad Marin. Quæst.* ii. *ap. Mai Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* i. p. 64, etc.

[5] ὀψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου. The present reading is ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων.

gelist Matthew published the gospel in the Hebrew tongue.

According to Jerome, the authentic gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. 'Matthew, also called Levi, who from being a publican became an apostle, first wrote a gospel of Christ in Judea, in the Hebrew language and letters, for the benefit of those of the circumcision who believed. Who afterwards translated it into Greek is uncertain.'[1] Thus Jerome believed that Matthew wrote his gospel in Aramæan. In the same passage, he states that the Nazarenes, who had a copy of the original in Pamphilus's library at Cæsarea, allowed him to make a copy of it (*describere*).

Elsewhere he relates that he translated the gospel according to the Hebrews, which the Nazarenes and Ebionites used, into Greek and Latin.[2]

Does Jerome identify these two documents, the Aramæan original of Matthew and the Gospel according to the Hebrews? Meyer supposes he does not, chiefly because Jerome affirms that he merely *copied* the former, and *translated* the latter. The Hebrew Matthew, he thinks, did not need *translation*, because in Jerome's time it had been already rendered both into Greek and Latin. But it is plain that the learned father did not mean to draw this distinction, because he says that both documents were in the hands of the Nazarenes. It was *they* who gave him permission to transcribe the Aramæan, and they were the people who, along with the Ebionites, used the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

But some say that though Jerome believed in the identity of the two documents at one time, he subsequently retracted the opinion, as is indicated by the use of the phrases, 'which is called by most the authentic

[1] 'Matthæus qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judea propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit. Quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est.'—*De Viris Illustr.* c. 3.

[2] *De Viris Illustr.* c. 2.

work of Matthew,' 'as most think.'[1] It has been thought that this language implies a strong suspicion in his mind, and that though he does not expressly avow a change, he does so virtually in attributing to *the many* or to *most people* what he himself once believed. We admit that the doubtful way in which he speaks about the identity of the two is found in writings posterior to those in which that identity is implied; for the phrase 'called by most the authentic work of Matthew,'[2] is, in his commentary on Matthew, written six years later than the treatise 'De Viris Illustribus;' and the expression, 'as most think,'[3] twenty-three years later, in his book against Pelagianism. Yet it is difficult to suppose that a scholar like Jerome, who had translated a document into Greek and Latin, could be so ignorant of its nature as to confound it with another work. The expressions on which his supposed change of belief is based, may be explained on other grounds. Additions had been made to the document by the persons in whose hands it was preserved, sufficient to create a difficulty in the mind as to whether it really proceeded from an apostle. Though its contents agreed substantially with the Greek gospel, it exhibited deviations from it which could not be thought other than corruptions; modifications and interpolations sometimes absurd, ridiculous, or apocryphal. Besides, the sect that used it had begun to be considered heretical by the great body of catholic Christians; and Jerome was jealous of his fair name and unsullied orthodoxy. To his timid mind it may have appeared hazardous to identify the document peculiar to a sect with the authentic Aramæan. Had he altered his opinion, he had every reason for saying so openly; the fact that he speaks cautiously, is an indication that he did not in his heart retract a former view.

[1] 'Quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum; ut plerique autumant.'
[2] '*Vocatur a plerisque* Matthæi authenticum.' [3] 'Ut plerique autumant.'

Passages from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, occur in the writings of Clement, Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome, which do not throw much light on its original identity with the present Greek gospel,[1] because with considerable likeness there is also dissimilarity. The discrepancies consist, for the most part, of additions to the text of the Greek ; and are usually of an apocryphal character. The state of both, as far as we know it, consists with the fact of their original identity, but only on condition that the Gospel according to the Hebrews had been rendered into Greek ; that its text both in Aramæan and in Greek, *as we know it from patristic citations*, was of a later type than the canonical Greek—facts which do not disprove the common origin of the Aramæan and present Greek.

The fathers did not regard the Gospel according to the Hebrews as canonical, because it was almost peculiar to parties who were not Gentile Christians, because it had apocryphal passages, and because they had a Greek one which they received as canonical from its supposed connection with an apostle. Doubtless they thought that the Hebrew Christians had corrupted it.

The original identity of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Aramæan Matthew would be disproved, could it be shown that the former was written at first in Greek, and thence translated into Aramæan. But this has not been proved, though good critics, like Credner, De Wette, and Bleek have made the attempt. One argument they allege is founded on Jerome's statement, that Barabbas was interpreted in it, *son of their master*,[2] arising, as is alleged, from an error of the translator, who mistook the etymology of the Greek

[1] The existing fragments are given by Anger, in his *Synopsis Evangeliorum*, with the corresponding passages of the canonical gospels, 1851; by Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, for 1863, p. 352, *et seq.*, and his *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum*, fasciculus iv.; also by Mr. Nicholson, in his work entitled *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*.

[2] 'Filius magistri eorum.'

word Barabbas,[1] and put for it the Aramæan,[2] *son of their master*.[3] But the expression is only a witty explanation of the proper name, importing that the Jews and Barabbas had one master and father, viz. Satan.[4] Again, in speaking of John Baptist's food, it had 'wild honey, whose taste was like manna, or cakes made with honey and oil.'[5] Hence it is inferred that the author of the Aramæan document used a Greek source in which he read 'cakes' by mistake for 'locusts.'[6] The introduction of the word arose from another cause. Whoever made the addition to 'wild honey,'[7] by describing it 'whose taste was like manna, or cakes made with honey and oil,' had regard to Numb. xi. 8, where it is applied to the manna; and this description was annexed in Aramæan to the Aramæan of 'wild honey.' The Greek translator of the copy which Epiphanius had, looking at the Septuagint version of Numb. xi. 8, found the words 'cake of oil,'[8] and adopted them. The mistake was made by the translator of the Aramæan, and does not prove the Greek original of the Ebionite or Nazarene gospel.

The hypothesis of the Greek original of the Gospel according to the Hebrews has the statements of the fathers, of Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome against it, which speak of a Hebrew original. It is also contradicted by the early opinion that the Gospel of the Hebrews was identical with the Hebrew original of Matthew.

This chain of testimonies need not be followed further. Ancient witnesses are unanimous in favour of the opinion that Matthew wrote a gospel in Hebrew.

[1] Βαραββᾶς. [2] בר רבהן instead of בר אבא

[3] *Comment. in Matth.* xxvii. 16.

[4] See Anger's *Synopsis Evangeliorum Matthæi, Marci, Lucæ*, etc. p. 275.

[5] *μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ*; see Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* xxix. 9.

[6] *ἐγκρίδες* by mistake for *ἀκρίδες*.

[7] *μέλι ἄγριον*. [8] *ἐγκρὶς ἐξ ἐλαίου*.

They also attest the fact of its identity with the so-called Gospel of the Nazarenes. The slightest trace of an opposite tradition does not appear. The apostle wrote in Judea; and the fathers who furnish traditional information respecting his Hebrew gospel lived for a time in that country, with the exception of Papias and Irenæus. Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius resided in the birthplace of the first gospel. Is it not strange therefore, that they found no trace of Matthew's writing in Greek instead of Hebrew? Was it not the interest of the catholic Church to preserve the tradition of a Greek original, since it adopted the Greek alone as canonical? When we consider that the original was in the hands of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, disfigured by additions, along with the prevalent opinion of the orthodox fathers that the Aramæan was Matthew's own, does it not appear unaccountable that the catholic Christians should never have adduced the hypothesis of a Greek original? All their prepossessions would have contributed to prevent the true account disappearing, so that they could not even hint at the possibility of a Greek instead of an Aramæan original.

The advocates of a Greek original also reason in favour of that hypothesis, from the form of the quotations. Bleek has put the case most skilfully with this object. According to him, the citations in the gospel are of two kinds, viz. those in which the evangelist gives pragmatic indications respecting the fulfilment of expressions in the Old Testament; and those where passages are quoted or used in the course of the narrative, as they occur in the discourses of persons who are introduced speaking. The latter are adduced according to the LXX, sometimes verbally, even in cases where the LXX depart from the Hebrew; and sometimes with more freedom, but not in such a way as to lead to the supposition of the deviation being due to consultation of the Hebrew text. The former are adduced according

to the writer's own translation from the Hebrew, departing not merely from the words but also the sense of the LXX, whose expressions are seldom seen through the places. This class of citations certainly forms the nucleus of the gospel, because by far the greater part of the sayings of Jesus and others must have existed in the original Aramæan. If therefore they were conceived in Aramæan, why should they be given here in a form corresponding to that of the Greek version, even where it is contrary to the Hebrew text? And if the translator took such liberty with the one class, why did he not do so with the other?[1]

The fact that the Messianic passages are everywhere cited after the Hebrew, is obviously favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramæan original. As to the class which follows the LXX rather than the Hebrew, the argument founded upon it against an Aramæan original would be of more weight, if the canonical Greek had been derived from Matthew's authentic gospel *immediately*. But it is only the last redaction of successive translations or revisions, in all of which the original was freely handled. Why these liberties were not indulged in the discourses and speeches, it is difficult to ascertain. But it is conceivable that they may have influenced the one more than the other, while a translation was being made. In the case of passages cited to show the fulfilment of prophecy, exactness is of considerable moment, and therefore they are taken directly from the original. The reason for preserving such exactness ceases in the case of passages from the Old Testament introduced into discourses; and therefore a translator might find it easier and well adapted to his object to employ the LXX. The difference of procedure in the two cases, which is not however invariable, may be accounted for by the peculiarities of both.

[1] *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, pp. 57, 58.

Adherence to the original was more required in the one because it contained proof or argument.

The prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine has been urged by Hug and his followers, as evidence of Matthew's writing in Greek. No valid argument has been adduced to show that Jesus and his apostles habitually spoke Greek instead of Syro-Chaldaic. Nor can it be shown that the latter dialect was *supplanted* by the former, among the Jews and Jewish Christians in Palestine, before the destruction of Jerusalem. All evidence goes to prove that the persons for whom Matthew wrote used Aramæan as their vernacular tongue. It is true that Greek was also employed in Judea at the time. But it did not prevail over the other. Josephus wrote his history of the Jewish war at first in Hebrew or Aramæan, which he calls *native language*;[1] and afterwards rendered it into Greek, which is termed Ἕλλας γλῶσσα.[2] The latter he calls a foreign dialect,[3] in relation to himself and his countrymen. His Greek edition was intended for 'those who were under the Roman dominion,' i.e. for Greeks and such others throughout the Roman dominion as used their language. The historian does not mean his Jewish brethren in Palestine, as the context shows. If then Josephus terms Syro-Chaldaic his *native tongue* as contrasted with Greek to which he applies *a foreign dialect*,[4] which of the two would Matthew writing for the use of his countrymen naturally choose? Even granting that the natives of Palestine were as familiar with Greek as they were with Aramæan, would he prefer a foreign dialect to a native one—to that which was best fitted to procure a favourable hearing? We do not deny that Greek circulated in Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles. But there is abundant evidence to show

[1] πάτριος γλῶσσα. [2] *De Bello Judaico*, Procem.
[3] ξένη διάλεκτος.—*Antiq.* Procem. 2.
[4] ξένη καὶ ἀλλοδαπὴ διάλεκτος.

that Aramæan *prevailed*, as we infer from the fact that the Septuagint did not supersede the original Hebrew in popular estimation, in Palestine. When therefore it is considered that Matthew, as a Jew, wrote a gospel for the use of his brethren in Palestine, it is reasonable to conclude that he would employ the language for which they had a predilection. And this is attested by the early fathers.

Diodati and Hug made great efforts to neutralise the arguments derived from Josephus and others in favour of the prevalence of Aramæan in Palestine. Since their day others have taken up and repeated, but not improved their arguments, without shaking the evidence that Matthew wrote in Aramæan. If the early fathers who attest the fact were all mistaken or deceived in the matter, critics of the nineteenth century are very credulous in supposing that the apostle wrote a gospel at all. Early testimony to the effect that Matthew wrote a Greek gospel does not exist till the time of Apollinaris (about A.D. 180), who could have known nothing certain on the subject, and may have been far more readily mistaken than his predecessors who testified that Matthew wrote in Hebrew. In fact the supporters of the hypothesis that the apostle wrote the present canonical gospel, are able to adduce no evidence in its favour; and it is only by upholding the voice of all antiquity affirming that Matthew wrote a gospel in Aramæan, that any connection between him and the canonical Greek one can be asserted. In explaining away ancient evidence they set aside the fact that Matthew wrote a gospel at all. The critics who refer the canonical Greek in its present state to the apostle as its author, have no ground to stand upon. Near the end of the second century they can point to Apollinaris, who assigned it to Matthew; but before that time, the evidence that the apostle wrote in Aramæan is unanimous.

It is needless to notice other arguments, if they

deserve that name, adduced by the advocates of a Greek original written by Matthew himself; such as the existence of the old Syriac being made from the present Greek; a work of supererogation, it is alleged, if an Aramæan original existed; because the Peshito originated after the Greek had been accepted as a canonical production in Syria. The element of time annihilates this objection to an Aramæan original gospel, added to the fact that the canonical Greek is not a proper version at all. Equally nugatory is it to say with Credner, that the Greek original of the gospel is affirmed by its continual coincidence with the gospels of Mark and Luke, and admits of no explanation on the hypothesis of a translation from the Hebrew. The verbal correspondences in question are owing to the use of Matthew's gospel by Mark and Luke; but no critic argues that the present Greek gospel is a simple version. Though it is not an original it approaches the nature of one by the various forms through which it passed, from the time of its incipient derivation from the Aramæan. It is also irrelevant to affirm, with Olshausen, that, while all the fathers of the church assert that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, they make use of the Greek text universally as a genuine apostolic composition; as if these writers, living so late, had any choice in the matter. They had not an opportunity of seeing the Aramæan, which, in their times, was in the hands of some Judaising Christians; and had they been able to procure it, they could not have read it. The Greek alone was within their reach, which they accepted as Matthew's without any definite authority for the authorship. Tradition regarded it as such, and they fell in with it. As to Olshausen's other statements about the Greek being received by all parties, and no objections being made to it by the opponents of the catholic Church, the same answer suffices. Whatever *opponents of the Church* may mean, they could not advance objections to the Greek as long

as they were totally ignorant of the Hebrew gospel; nor would it have been for their interest to do so. They accepted the tradition about the relation of the Greek to the apostle. The Nazarenes and Ebionites alone having, as they thought, the authentic work, used it more or less; though they too, being uncritical, would hardly have objected to the indirectly apostolic origin of the Greek.

The exact relationship of Matthew's to the Greek gospel that bears his name is uncertain. Jerome says, that the person who translated the Aramæan original was unknown. The apostle himself was not the translator; the supposition that he published two works, one in Aramæan and another in Greek, is baseless. It is equally conjectural to assert that some of his friends or disciples rendered the Hebrew gospel into Greek with his sanction or approval. Were the latter hypothesis worth a moment's notice, the question might still be asked, What evidence exists for identifying the present Greek gospel with the version of the friend or disciple? Should it be said that he *composed* the Greek gospel rather than translated, the assertion would be equally unfounded. Apologists have indulged in many assumptions which are often of the strangest sort: for example, that the Aramæan and Greek gospels existed for some time in their important parts as an oral tradition side by side; that the Aramæan was the first committed to writing, circulating chiefly among the Jewish Christians in Palestine; and that the Greek oral gospel, its counterpart, was afterwards put into a written form when the Hellenistic Jews felt the want of it. The latter was made in the time of the apostle, probably under his eye or even by himself!

There is no tangible evidence to connect the present gospel with the apostle Matthew. The oldest witness in favour of such relationship is a fragment from Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis (A.D. 180), who says, that

the Quartodecimans, as they have been called, appealed to Matthew for their view of the paschal supper being on the fourteenth of Nisan, which can only mean that they referred to the present Greek gospel.[1] In what manner or from what cause, the canonical Greek came to be assigned to the apostle cannot be determined. The most probable reason is, that it bears some relationship to the authentic Aramæan; not that of a version, since the marks of a version are wanting, but of a work founded upon the latter. It is unlikely that Jerome would have translated the Gospel of the Hebrews, which he identified with the Aramæan of Matthew, had the Greek canonical gospel which existed in his day been a simple version of the same original. Hence it is probable that the present Greek gospel was *based upon* the Aramæan of Matthew, or in other words, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Having originated in the latter, the name of the apostle was transferred from the older to the more recent document, by those who had little if any knowledge of the process of derivation. The steps by which it arose out of the Aramæan are unknown. Different translations had preceded it, enlarged more or less by traditional materials, just as the Aramæan itself received corrections in its transmission. Oral sayings, apocryphal narratives, mythic elements, furnished the final redactor with materials; and he proceeded to put the whole into a shape which commended itself to the catholic Christians as far superior to the imperfect and fragmentary Greek gospels which preceded. The latter probably retained more of the character of versions, though indifferent ones; versions that ceased to represent the original faithfully because of their looseness as well as their omissions and additions, while the former lost the nature of a version under the plastic hand of those who moulded it into its present form by removing several peculiarities and substitut-

[1] *Chron. Pasch. Alex.*, ed. Bonn, vol. i. p. 14.

ing more. In the absence of definite information, the critic must be contented with such presumptions. The canonical Greek is the outcome of preceding gospels resembling it in substance, but neither so comprehensive nor so well digested. Ecclesiastical writers, who lived so long after the apostle's death that they could know nothing certain about Matthew's connection with the Greek gospel, were ready to receive it as his; for they were uncritical enough to believe things which have not the support even of credible tradition. If, therefore, it be objected that there is no external evidence for various recensions or redactions of the first gospel, it may be said with equal truth that there is no external evidence to show that Matthew wrote it. Besides, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was one form of the canonical gospel, so that external evidence is not wholly wanting on behalf of one recension at least. We allow that the 'oracles,' as Papias terms Matthew's composition, must have been a small record of what Jesus said and did; that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, even in its early state, had departed from primitive simplicity, and was being added to or altered; and that the canonical Greek, compared with it, is substantially another work.

The majority of critics believe in some connection between the Gospel of the Hebrews and the present Greek Matthew, making it at least a document which the evangelist used in a Greek recension or version. One thing is certain, that it was highly esteemed and used by the early fathers—Papias, Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, some of whom took it for the original Hebrew Matthew. It is impossible to tell its extent; but we know from the stichometry of Nicephorus, that a Greek translation of it had 2,200 *stichoi*, the canonical Matthew having 2,500, and Mark 2,000.[1] Even Nicephorus does not put it

[1] Credner's *Geschichte des N. T. Kanon*, p. 242, *et seq.*

among the apocryphal books of the New Testament, but among the Antilegomena, as Eusebius also does.

### APOSTOLICITY.

The following phenomena in the gospel are adverse to its having been composed in its present state by an apostle and eyewitness, and therefore to its being an exact version of a gospel written by Matthew.

1. It contains unhistorical and mythical elements. The most palpable example of this is in xxvii. 52, where we are told, that at the expiration of Jesus the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints who slept arose, came out of their resting-places after the resurrection of their Lord, and even went into the holy city where they appeared to many. The apocryphal nature of this account is apparent.

Again the narrative in xxvii. 62–66, xxviii. 11–15, respecting the setting of a watch at the sepulchre, and the bribing of them, is historically improbable. The chief priests and Pharisees could not have known of Jesus saying that he would rise again after three days, because he did not foretell this in an intelligible way even to his disciples (xvi. 21). Had the women known of the watch being set at the sepulchre, they would not have confined their attention to the rolling away of the stone and the anointing of the body. And the conduct of the Sanhedrists is unaccountable in instructing the soldiers to spread a false report, instead of calling them to account for their delinquency. It is not likely that they would have acted towards Pilate as is represented; or that he would have been satisfied with their representation. Still farther, the legendary incidents connected with the birth and infancy of Jesus point to a later time than that of Matthew. The star in the east guiding the wise men from afar to the house in which the babe was, the flight into Egypt, and the slaughter of the innocents in Bethlehem by Herod, are unhistorical.

The advent of the Messiah has an oriental colouring and mythic haze.

2. Some things are put in a wrong order and are therefore chronologically incorrect. Thus the sermon on the mount, which is intended for an inaugural discourse, is placed too early. Its delivery not only before the immediate disciples of Jesus, but a large multitude of people assembled to hear, implies that Jesus had exercised his ministry for a considerable time and attracted the attention of the multitude to himself, so that their minds were prepared to some extent for a discourse of comprehensive morality. And the passages in it which imply that Jesus was the Messiah, v. 17 and vii. 21–24, are anticipative, as we infer from xvi. 17. To have announced himself as the Messiah so early would have been contrary to his cautious and gradual introduction of the idea, especially as the minds of his hearers were unsusceptible of it at the time.

In like manner, the charge of Jesus to the twelve in x. 19, etc., is introduced too soon, the disciples being told that the Son of man should come again to set up his kingdom before they had gone over the cities of Israel. Thus his second advent is announced as just at hand. If the discourse here be not out of place, it is inconsistent with xxiv. 14, where the second advent is spoken of as a much later event. Either supposition does not harmonise with the apostolic composition of x. 19, etc., or its correct reporting.

3. Things are related in a way which shows the mixture of later tradition. Thus the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew speaks first of the destruction of Jerusalem; and, from the twenty-ninth verse, of the coming of Messiah immediately after, which was not fulfilled. There is therefore some inaccuracy in reporting the discourse of Jesus on this occasion. In like manner, the signs and wonders preceding the destruction of Jerusalem do not correspond to facts. False

Messiahs did not appear then; nor did any important wars take place, as is intimated in the sixth and seventh verses of the chapter. Köstlin,[1] in his successful attempt to disprove Baur's reference of the chapter to the time of Hadrian rather than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, has failed to show that all the traits described suit the latter period.

4. Other particulars are wrongly narrated, as is the case with the miraculous feeding of the four thousand men in the wilderness very soon after a similar event. (Compare xv. 32–38 with xiv. 16–21.) One thing is doubled, as the facts are substantially the same, the minor circumstances alone being different. The disciples of Jesus who had witnessed the feeding of five thousand men so recently and under like conditions, would hardly have been so forgetful or thriftless as to ask, 'Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness as to fill so great a multitude?' In like manner, the same transaction is repeated in xii. 22–30 and ix. 32–34. The two passages are so similar that we must assume a double narrative of the same event. A similar repetition of the same thing appears in xvi. 1, where the event in xii. 38 is re-enacted. In the former place we are told that the Pharisees and Sadducees asked of Jesus a sign from heaven, when it is improbable that two such opposite parties should have united in presenting the same demand. The Sadducees were persons not likely to join with the Pharisees either in this matter or others.

Again, Jesus is represented as riding into Jerusalem on two animals, an ass and a colt, which has arisen from misunderstanding the prophecy referred to (xxi. 2, 7, compared with Zech. ix. 9). Nor is this the only instance in which the sense of a passage in the Hebrew Scriptures has been turned aside to make it apply to

[1] *Der Ursprung und die Composition der synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 113, *et seq.*

Jesus; or in which the narrative has been modified to suit a supposed prediction. In Zechariah only one animal is alluded to, named in two parallel members,[1] which is converted into two in xxi. 2, 'an ass and a colt *with her*;' a phrase excluding Meyer's idea that the *and* in xxi. 7, 'an ass *and* a colt,' is epexegetical (*even*).

Again, in xii. 39, etc., the writer puts an erroneous interpretation of the disciples into the mouth of their master in the fortieth verse; for the allusion to the resurrection of Jesus is foreign to the original connection as well as to the view with which the preceding and subsequent verses were spoken. Jesus did not mean that *his resurrection* was a sign to the generation then alive, but *his preaching*. This corresponds with the sign of Jonas the prophet to the Ninevites; which was not his abode in the fish, according to Luke xi. 29–31.

The words which Jesus addressed to the apostles after his resurrection (xxviii. 19, 20) savour of a later time. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles that baptism was always *into the name of Christ*, or *into Christ*. Such seems to have been the early mode of initiation. When later reflection unfolded the relation of Christ to the Father and the Spirit, the formula 'into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit' arose. It is not original and could hardly have been prescribed by Jesus himself.

From xxviii. 9–20 we see that every appearance of the risen Saviour to the disciples in Judea is excluded, and only one Galilean manifestation implied. This shows post-apostolicity, because such personal intercourse with the disciples does not consist with the original idea of the resurrection and ascension being coincident, excluding an interval of time between them. The Galilean appearance, however, accords with the fact that the first gospel follows Galilean tradition in confining the ministry of Jesus to that land.

[1] חמור and עיר.

Again, the narrative of the temptation of Jesus assumes a historical shape, as if an outward and real occurrence were recorded. Though intended by the writer for history, it cannot be accepted as such. It is either ideal, or thoughts suggested to the mind of Jesus were transformed by later tradition into an actual objective history. In any case, the thing described did not happen as it is depicted. It may have a basis of fact; the narration is certainly unapostolic.

5. Some things partake of a character so marvellous as to exclude their apostolic description. So in xvii. 27, respecting the piece of money in a fish's mouth provided for tribute. The miracle seems to be unnecessary, since a stater might have been procured in the usual way. Nor did Jesus ever work a miracle for himself. Besides, it is not said that the piece of money was actually found in the mouth of the fish. The accomplishment is not noticed, as on other occasions. And while it is certainly possible that the piece of money may have been in the fish's mouth—for cases of this sort have occurred—it is not probable that the money would have been there ready for use rather than in the stomach. The miracle is gratuitous.

Such are the surest evidences of non-apostolicity in the first gospel, and they are not the only ones that might be adduced; others will appear in our subsequent analysis of the contents, to confirm the post-apostolicity of the present Greek gospel. In pursuance of the same object, some critics adduce particulars in the other gospels disagreeing with the first; but it is a precarious thing to insist upon them. The reasoning which gives the preference to the accounts of Mark, Luke, or John, and judges of parallel accounts in Matthew accordingly, is often liable to suspicion. We do not say that all particulars in the first gospel are more correct than those in the other synoptics; but that many of them are. Sometimes the original tradition is preserved by

Mark or Luke, when a later one is given by Matthew; as in xxvii. 34, where the drink offered to Jesus is vinegar *mingled with gall*, which he would not drink because of its bitter taste; whereas in Mark it was mingled with *myrrh*, to produce intoxication and ease pain. The tradition respecting the gall is a later one derived from Psalm lxix. 21, which converts the draught into a manifestation of enmity instead of compassion. But such cases are comparatively few, and do not invalidate our general principle, which is strikingly exemplified in the twenty-eighth chapter of St. Matthew, where nothing is said of the mode in which Jesus was parted from his disciples, and it is only implied that he had gone to the Father. This idea was subsequently developed as we find it in other gospels. It is invalid to adduce the want of graphic description in one who was an eyewitness like Matthew. Picturesque delineation does not necessarily belong to an apostle. Vivid description is a talent which does not depend on an external call. And the nature of Matthew's occupation was unfavourable to vivid painting. We could not expect much of the picturesque from a collector of taxes. The graphic power of accomptants is usually feeble. At all events, natural talent is not changed but elevated by inspiration. If the writer had not the gift of picturesqueness before he became an apostle, he would not have it afterwards.

As to the sources of the gospel, if it be true that Matthew wrote brief Aramæan *oracles* or *discourses*, he did not use written compilations, but drew from Galilean traditions and actual knowledge. The case of the person who put the Greek gospel into its present shape is different. He had written sources more or less copious; and Greek paraphrases of the original Aramæan. It is likely that he consulted independent collections of gospel facts, for in no other way can duplicates of the same thing be explained, the second of which could have been introduced only out of a written

source, not from oral tradition. Thus the present gospel is based on the Aramæan document written by the apostle as well as on some smaller collections, along with unwritten tradition. There is no proof that the compilers used the primitive Mark-document, of which we shall speak immediately. It is by no means easy always to assign the respective portions to their respective sources; though earlier and later, historical and unhistorical materials may be distinguished. The writers selected and added, not without a theological bias that shaped the materials, especially the Old Testament passages which are systematically turned aside from their original meaning to show Jesus as the Messiah. If these remarks be correct, Holtzmann's distribution of the gospel into two leading documents, the *logia* or primitive Matthew, the primitive Mark, and tradition, is conjectural; with an unmistakable bias in favour of Mark's originality that does injustice to Matthew.[1] That there was a Greek collection of discourses or sayings written by the apostle Matthew, is destitute of all historical basis. Ancient testimony is unanimous in favour of its being composed in Aramæan. One of the primary documents in Holtzmann's scheme of the mutual connection of the synoptics—a Greek gospel by Matthew—falls away. Nor is there the least probability that any *Greek* translation circulated as *the acknowledged representative* of the Aramæan *logia*.

### ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The gospel may be divided into three parts, viz. the introductory history, chapters i.–iv; the Messiah's ministry in Galilee, v.–xviii.; the conclusion of his work, and death at Jerusalem, xix.–xxviii.

The first portion contains the genealogical register of Jesus and his birth in Bethlehem; the circumstances

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien, u. s. w.*, p. 169, *et seq.*

connected with his birth, such as the visit of the magi, the flight to Egypt, and the return to Nazareth. This is followed by the public appearance of John and the baptism of Jesus. The fourth chapter describes his temptation and entrance into public life.

There is little doubt that the first two chapters always belonged to the present Greek gospel, since they are found in all unmutilated MSS. and ancient versions. The earliest fathers had them in their copies as part of the work. Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, attest their existence. So do the early heretics, Cerinthus and his followers, Celsus, and Porphyry. Their diction is of the same character with the rest of the gospel. The language and style are similar. But the question is, Were the chapters in the Aramæan *logia* of Matthew? The portion was wanting in the Ebionite copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as Epiphanius testifies. Did the Ebionites cut it off because they denied the miraculous conception of Jesus? Epiphanius leads us to believe that they mutilated and corrupted the gospel; and his testimony may pass for what it is worth. The same father, in saying of the Nazarenes that they had the gospel in its fullest form or entire in Hebrew, probably warrants us to conclude that their copy had these chapters; and Jerome's comments on Habbak. iii. 3 and Isai. xi. may justify the inference. But Epiphanius is an untrustworthy writer. As a matter of fact, his testimony respecting the commencement of the gospel of the Ebionites, which was only another and later recension of that according to the Hebrews with the third chapter of the present Greek, may be accepted. He says expressly of Ebion, that he declared Christ to be the son of Joseph and Mary, just as Cerinthus and Carpocrates did, on the ground of the same gospel. Origen distinguishes two classes of Ebionites, one acknowledging Christ to be born of a virgin, the other

not. Following internal evidence, we should be disposed to say, that the chapters did not belong to the original *logia*. Their contents hang loosely together, and do not harmonise well. The supernatural birth hardly agrees with the genealogy ; and the latter terminates in Joseph without expressing the direct connection between him and Jesus. Though the writer intended to give the latter's genealogy, he breaks off abruptly, without specifying the proper link of connection between him and Joseph. The evangelist seems to have adopted a written account, instead of composing the chapters out of oral tradition. If so, he altered the words of the sixteenth verse, to make suitable room for the introduction of the supernatural generation of Jesus ; severing, however, by that means the proper link of connection between the preceding and following parts. Of what use was it to trace the descent of Jesus from David and show his Messiahship, if He had not a natural father ? Besides, the first two chapters are largely imbued with the traditional. The ideas expressed respecting the generation of Jesus Christ, the visit of the Magi, and the appearance of the miraculous star that guided them, the conduct of Herod towards them, the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem, and the flight into Egypt, partake of the mythic, and symbolise certain ideas. The supernatural conception is the legendary symbol of a spiritual nature superior to the characteristic type of humanity. It is improbable that an apostle would have set forth such relations as historical. They are too early for his time.

The 4th chapter, giving an account of the temptation, narrates it as an outward historical fact, for such expressions as 'the devil taketh him up,' 'the devil setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple,' &c., imply nothing else. This is followed by a rapid outline of the proceedings of Jesus, that the author may come to the full history of the Messianic ministry.

The second division of the gospel begins with the sermon on the mount, which is a sort of programme of the Messianic kingdom founded by Jesus. This discourse is orderly and connected. The development is simple and the sequence natural. The essential contents appear to be original and direct, leaving an impression of freshness on the mind that cannot be mistaken. A pure ethical spirit, free from religious dogmatism, breathes throughout; showing that the truths taught came from the moral consciousness of one who had the loftiest, as well as the simplest, ideas of the absolute, in practical ethics. Mosaism is lifted up into a spiritual essence; the law inculcates a pure morality. The principles enunciated, unsustained by argument or authority, and in the form of simple assertion, are left to stand self-supported, with a sublime confidence in the majesty of truth. Jesus appears as the reformer of the law, giving it a higher significance than the Pharisaic or even the original one. Without abolishing he sublimates it. But though the substance of the discourse be original, it has received its form and position from a redactor, who has sometimes brought together utterances of Jesus belonging to different times. The general outline, including the commencement and conclusion, with the intervening succession of ideas, is genuine; but cognate elements are introduced to expand and fill out the discourse. This view is supported by the fact, that Luke and Mark distribute in different places various sentences in the connected sermon of the first gospel. It is also confirmed by the circumstance, that the discourse is wrought into a united whole, of which the parts and particulars are fitted into their places. Such elaboration is adverse to the idea that the sermon is the same as when it was spoken. It is also confirmed by the circumstance that there is no proper connection between a few sentences here and there; for example, at the eighteenth verse. In proportion as the sermon exhibits

plan and purpose, as a whole and in separate parts, does its originality cease to be immediate. It formed a considerable part of the *discourses* which Matthew wrote; but it is against probability that it was spoken exactly as we have it and at the commencement of Jesus's ministry. Its true position is later, when the minds of the disciples were better prepared for spiritual truth. Luke places it later; and though we cannot assign the preference to his record, either in form or originality, the time he assigns to it is nearer the truth. The sermon as the first gospel presents it is *relatively* not *absolutely* original. The extent, the regular development of ideas, the unity, the logical arrangement, especially in the first part, the palpable evidence of plan, show the influence of later reflection. The form is less original than the contents; though some of these have been imported into the discourse out of other times and occasions. Thus the eighteenth and nineteenth verses of the 5th chapter are of later origin, since they disturb the connection and were never appealed to by the Judaising party, though authoritative in their favour. When Paulinism had weakened the claims of the law among Christians, those who adhered to the old Judaic Christianity attempted to make it more rigid, and put into authentic discourses remarks directed against Paulinism, as those in vii. 13–20. The twentieth and following verses of the fifth chapter show that Jesus had respect to the spiritual import of the law rather than its external observance; and that he could not have pronounced him to be great in the kingdom of heaven who conformed to the minutiæ of legal and ceremonial observances.[1] Though the verses in question were not spoken by Jesus, they are in harmony with the Jewish Christian or primitive parts of the gospel. Matthew himself may have put them where they are.

In like manner, the addition of *in spirit* to 'the

[1] Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, p. 212.

poor' in v. 3, is unauthentic on the lips of Jesus. Luke's report is right, and the Essene sentiment original. The three verses appended to the seven beatitudes (v. 10–12) also belong to the evangelist, not to the speaker. Notwithstanding these and perhaps some other additions, the report of the sermon is substantially correct.

This great discourse so fully recorded in Matthew's gospel is often depreciated, in spite of its author and excellence, by a class of divines. Thus one reckons it among the *earthly things*, not *the heavenly*, with which Christ commenced as he 'looked forward to the coming of the Comforter to complete what he had thus begun.' The ethical character of the sermon does not suit the taste of dogmatic theologians, and they must therefore give it an inferior place.[1]

The sermon on the mount is followed by a series of miraculous works which Jesus performed in Galilee, viii., ix. 38. The cures related and the miracles performed follow one another in rapid succession. After pronouncing a long discourse, the Saviour is represented as engaged almost entirely in wonderful cures, without distinct or considerable intervals of time. We cannot well resist the conclusion that the evangelist groups together a number of operations to make a portrait of Jesus's Messianic agency. That such was his object is perceptible from bodily and spiritual states of derangement being equally represented as the subjects of cure; from the calling of Matthew being inserted in the series; from the brief forcible sayings in viii. 18–22; but especially from viii. 17, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses.' Jesus was to fulfil the Old Testament predictions respecting the Messiah's operations. The evangelist groups a series of

[1] See Dr. Plumptre's exposition of St. Matthew in the *New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, by various writers, vol. i. p. 20.

facts which present Messiah in close contact with humanity, the Son of man compassionating the condition of his brethren and ministering to their wants. This gives another aspect of Jesus as the Messiah ; not so much the ethical reformer introducing a kingdom of righteousness, as a sympathising brother entering into the peculiar circumstances of men and raising them from wretchedness to comfort. That the section owes much to the writer can scarcely be doubted by those who compare it with the sermon on the mount, which also partakes of the grouping character belonging to the present portion, as well as the summary introduction of the sermon, 'and Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people,' etc. etc. (iv. 23–25). The summary owed its present place and character to the evangelist's desire to get at once to the inaugural discourse of Jesus ; after which the general assertion is resolved into its details. The writer acts freely in setting the instances of the Messianic operation in rapid succession, that they may give a connected picture. He does not stay to specify times or places. The outward connection of the wonderful works performed evinces the reporter's subjectivity and reflection.

A new section begins with the 10th chapter. After Jesus says in ix. 37, 38, 'the harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers few ; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest,' the labourers are called and sent forth to the work, with a series of instructions respecting their conduct. The form of these instructions proceeds from the evangelist, since parts of them are not appropriate to the first mission of the apostles but are derived from a later period. This is plain from the sixteenth and following verses.

The 11th and 12th chapters open up the further and

wider progress of Jesus's ministry, especially the effects which it produced. Its results appear more marked, resolving themselves into adoption or recognition of his Messianic claims. The message of John the Baptist gives occasion not only to speak of the person and ministry of His forerunner, but of His own reception ; while he upbraids the cities in which he had wrought mighty works because of their unbelief. He expresses His union with the Father, in virtue of which he cheerfully acquiesces in all the divine arrangements ; and acknowledging that His mission would be believed in only by such as the Father had specially enlightened, he addresses a compassionate call to men to avail themselves of his aid.

The 12th chapter represents Jesus in conflict with the Pharisees, and His severe language against them. The collision was caused by the disciples plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath, and also by the cure of a blind and dumb man, which the Pharisees attributed to Satanic agency. One thing in the chapter has naturally arrested the attention of critics, viz. the charge of Jesus to the multitudes not to make him known (12, 15, 16). In the midst of publicity, while he performed remarkable cures openly and was in collision with the Pharisees, it is stated that he withdrew for the sake of privacy and enjoined the multitudes, who nevertheless followed him, not to speak of him and his deeds openly. The present is not the only place in the first gospel where such prohibition is recorded (see viii. 4 ; ix. 30). It is not so strange, however, at an earlier period, when he had not attained great publicity or been thrown into controversy with the Pharisees on account of his works. Here the prohibition is inappropriate. The evangelist himself appears to have felt so when he introduces a passage from Isai. xlii. 1–4, which he applies to the Messiah, as if a leading feature of his character were calmness and noiselessness, the absence of ostentation,

the exhibition of a modest retirement, a quiet consolation, which lodges in the minds of men with refreshing power. The inference is unavoidable that such prohibition on the part of Jesus was not uttered now, since it disagrees with the context in which it stands. The evangelist's adaptation of Isai. xlii. 1–4 to the Messiah is aside from the true sense of the passage; though he must have looked upon the description as a Messianic criterion.

The 13th chapter contains a group of parables, representing one aspect, the most attractive and influential, of the teaching of Jesus. Though the entire series is narrated as if spoken at one time, this is improbable. The parables were uttered on different occasions, and are unhistorically put into a connected group. The teaching of Jesus in Nazareth, recorded in xiii. 53–58, is identical with that of Luke iv. 16–30, though the latter places it too early. Chapters xiv.–xvii. contain a succession of events and circumstances, without any close connection. The narrative of Herod beheading John the Baptist; the feeding of five thousand persons; Jesus's walking on the sea; his cures in the land of Gennesaret; his conflict with the Pharisees, originating in the question about washing of hands; his discourse to the disciples, showing that what they should be most anxious to shun is moral and spiritual, not ceremonial, impurity; the interview with a Canaanitish woman; the feeding of the four thousand, which is merely a duplicate of a preceding occurrence in xiv. 17–21; the demand of the Pharisees for a sign, and the discourse respecting Sadducean and Pharisean leaven; Peter's confession, the transfiguration, the healing of a lunatic, and the narrative respecting the piece of money found in the mouth of a fish, constitute a loosely linked series. But the final catastrophe approaches. The opposition of the Pharisees and Sadducees becomes more intense, so that Jesus repeatedly announces his death and resurrection to the disciples (xvi. 21, etc.; xvii. 22, etc.)

The 19th chapter opens up a new epoch in the personal history of Jesus; for he is represented as leaving Galilee for Judea. On this journey he came into collision with the Pharisees respecting divorce and celibacy, blessed little children, had a conversation with a rich youth, and spoke of the rewards awaiting those who made sacrifices for the kingdom of heaven's sake. To this is appended the parable of labourers in a vineyard, which is peculiar to the first gospel. The request of Zebedee's sons shows how inadequately the minds of the apostles were prepared for the Messianic kingdom. Approaching Jericho, he healed two blind men.

The 21st chapter describes his entry into Jerusalem, the evangelist evidently knowing nothing of his stay in Bethany, his purification of the temple, and cursing of the fig-tree, which is unhistorical because contrary to the well-known character of the teacher. At the twenty-third verse of this chapter, a question of the Sanhedrists put to him respecting his authority, leads to three parables in which his opponents are aimed at, the breach between both becoming more open, sharp, and decided. The Pharisees put entangling questions; their enmity increasing as their polemics are turned aside or recoil on their own heads with defeat. In the 23rd chapter, Jesus speaks openly against the scribes and Pharisees, a class of men who had lain in wait for him a considerable time. His denunciation of them is severe, characterised by a tone of stern displeasure, consistent only with the idea that he looked upon them as involved in hopeless and irreconcilable hostility to the gracious purposes of God. The chapter concludes with a valedictory address to Jerusalem of the most mournful character.

The 24th chapter contains a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, with the downfall of the Jewish state and Jesus's second coming immediately after. This eschatological discourse harmonises with the ser-

mon on the mount in regard to freedom of composition. The writer's own subjectivity appears in it. That Jesus could not have spoken as he is represented, is apparent from the way in which John writes in the Apocalypse respecting the fate of Jerusalem. For three years and a half the apostle predicts that the city should be trodden down by the Gentiles, but that the temple should be spared. The rest of the city is neither to be possessed nor destroyed by the heathen. It is impossible that the apostle John could have written thus, had he heard Jesus foretell such a catastrophe as is described in the present chapter; and therefore considerable scope must be allowed for the matter and method of the discourse here given. There is great difficulty in extracting the authentic nucleus from the surroundings. One thing is pretty clear, that not till after the catastrophe which befell Jerusalem—a catastrophe which none of the early Christians foresaw—did any of the synoptists seek to have it plainly foretold by the Saviour.

The chapter before us raises a grave question. Did Jesus believe that he would return in a visible form to inaugurate his reign as Messiah? His discourse here, and many other sayings reported by the synoptists, especially Matt. x. 23; xxiii. 36, 39; xxiv. 34; xxvi. 64, contain an explicit prediction of his speedy return to preside at the judgment of mankind. Did he share the common Messianic belief of his time? So Strauss, Keim, and even Weizsäcker suppose, contrary, as we think, to the evidence of facts in the gospels themselves. He who transformed the contemporary Messianic ideas so radically, enunciating the spirituality and gradual growth of his kingdom, could not have apprehended his Messianic dignity under the crass form of current Judaism. In speaking of the future, he used the figurative language of the Old Testament, and was misapprehended. To harmonise their Judaic hopes with the conviction

that the crucified One was the Messiah, the disciples supposed he would return in a visible form to inaugurate his reign and judge mankind. The eschatological discourses which connect the fall of Jerusalem, the destruction of the temple and the end of the world, have been falsified by history; a fact which proves that Jesus did not utter them as they are. Doubtless they have been added to and revised after their original composition. Jewish ideas and expressions peculiar to the disciples or their followers are incorporated with them. This was owing to an imperfect apprehension of the imagery employed by Jesus, and also to the circumstances of the time immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem; for details are drawn from the troublous events that ushered in that catastrophe. The only authentic parts seem to be xxiv. 36–44, xxv. 1–13, 14–30. The rest are of later origin. We believe that a Jewish Christian document is embodied in xxiv. 4–35; not, however, in its original form or extent. The language of an apocalyptic comment, not a correct report of what Jesus said, appears in the paragraph, which seems to have been written about A.D. 68.

The opinion that Jesus did not predict his second coming in the crass way which the synoptists present, but in a spiritual form veiled under Jewish imagery, which his hearers did not rightly understand, is substantially that of Hase, Schenkel, Colani and Baur. But some difficulty attends it, because the expectation of the early church and of Paul himself does not agree (1 Thessal. iv. 15). The sensuous view still prevailed.

It is probable that the thing he foretold in connection with the overthrow of the theocracy was *the initiation of his kingdom*, that is, *his spiritual advent*. Foreseeing the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of its temple, he knew that the way was cleared for the victory of the new religion. The building up of the spiritual temple followed immediately upon the close of the theocratic

age. If Jesus described the ideal Israel in prophetic and figurative language like that used in the books of Daniel and Enoch, his hearers may have readily misapprehended his meaning. The statements in xxiv. 30 and xxvi. 64 are clearly unhistorical. The multitude prefer the letter to the spirit; and are dazzled with highly coloured imagery. The inauguration of the new era with its reign of righteousness, outlined as it probably was in a few bold metaphors by the Messiah himself, took an external shape.

Several parables follow, inculcating watchfulness and preparation for the approaching judgment; that of the faithful and the wicked servants, of the ten virgins, of the talents, and a description of the Messianic judgment. The sufferings, death, and resurrection are described in the last three chapters.

The concluding words of the gospel, containing a formal commission to the eleven to carry the glad tidings of salvation to the heathen and to baptize, come from apostolic tradition interpreting the mind of Christ. Though he did not himself enjoin a universal mission and baptism—a fact indirectly indicated by putting the command into the mouth of the risen Christ just before his ascension—early Christian consciousness apprehended his will aright in enunciating the comprehensive principle. That the gospel should be preached to all nations and baptism be the introductory mode of admitting them into the Church, are precepts that truly reflect the spirit of Jesus's teaching.

The general contents of the gospel seem to be historical, and the course of events natural. Artificial combination on the part of the evangelist, or transpositions and transmutations, both chronological and material, are not absent, but are scarcely a prominent feature. No doubt some portions are dislocated, and have not their proper connection. But the usual succession appears probable. One thing strikes the reader,

viz. the grouping together of discourses or parables which were delivered at different times. Thus the seven parables in the thirteenth chapter could not have been spoken in immediate succession and at the same time; though the evangelist gives one to understand that they were. After depicting the ministry of Jesus in Galilee, the close of it in Judea is distinctly described. It is divided into two periods, a Galilean and a Judean one. Yet plausible objections have been made to the authenticity of the contents, derived especially from the other three gospels. If Luke and Mark be considered independent documents having an authority of their own, the originality of Matthew is lessened. Or if they deserve the preference where they deviate from Matthew, the authenticity of the last is damaged. But this estimate cannot be approved. We believe that the first gospel being the oldest, is the principal source of the other synoptists. The critic should be cautious about setting the accounts of Luke and Mark above those of Matthew, or attacking the historical credibility of the first gospel by the help of the second and third. The only legitimate ground on which Matthew's gospel can be assailed is itself. The principle of grouping has influenced the character of the narration. What distinguishes the gospel most is its peculiar pragmatism or development. It has certainly mythical elements. As the traditional had sufficient time to mould and modify facts, before the canonical gospel was written, the historical credibility of certain portions is impaired. Both form and substance are coloured with the legendary. Had we the original Aramæan discourses, some of the hazy element which soon gathered round the evangelical materials would disappear. But even there perhaps it was not wanting. It is useless, however, to speak of what is irrecoverable. The present Greek gospel being a growth, and having been written above half a century after the events which it narrates, was

affected by the influences of an uncritical age, as also by the convulsive changes and revolutions that shook the world of Jews and Gentiles, filling men's minds with fear. The only criterion we have for separating the genuine from the non-historical is the interpreter's critical sagacity.

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL.

1. There are two elements in the gospel, of distinct and opposite tendency, the Jewish Christian or primitive Ebionite one, which regarded the new religion as a reformed stage of the old, accepting the Messiahship of Jesus and the pure morality He proclaimed; and a wider element which viewed the Gentile world as the soil of Christianity. The latter acquired predominance after the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, when the field of the world was opened up to the new religion, and Judaism received its death-blow. These particularist and universal elements interlace one another; evincing different writers and times; so that the composite gospel can only be apprehended after a careful survey of each. The authentic work of Matthew consisted of Jewish Christian parts; those with a liberal tendency were posterior. The ground-work was not left in its original state, but was subjected to revision. If we had the *logia* or the gospel according to the Hebrews in its first condition, the extent of such revision would appear; but fragments alone remain, and even they are valuable in indicating the changes which later hands made in the original document.

The first revision was effected by the translator of the Aramæan work, who added various particulars; the last belongs to the canonical evangelist himself. Between the two, there may have been others; for we cannot think that all the additions and changes proceeded from the final redactor. Hilgenfeld, who assumes no

intermediate reviser between the old Greek gospel cognate to that according to the Hebrews and the canonical evangelist, assigns much more to the latter than we can assent to. Thus he gives him the fourteenth verse of the twenty-fourth chapter: 'And this gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations;' words implying a later time than Hilgenfeld's date of the present gospel (A.D. 67) and a more enlarged mind than one that tolerated in the preceding context, 'many false prophets shall arise,' *if* these misleading teachers were Paulines as he supposes them to be.

Though it is not easy to point out the authentic portions written by the apostle Matthew in Aramæan, they are often perceptible. The other parts cannot be assigned to their respective revisers. All that can be done is to indicate such as belong to a time soon after the destruction of Jerusalem and those near the close of the first or the beginning of the second century.

Examples are the best proofs of the gospel's composite character. The sermon on the mount (v. 1–vii. 12) was an important and prominent element in the primitive document. So were parts of the eschatological discourses in chapters xxiv., xxv. But ch. i. 18—ii. 23 is an addition, though belonging to the apostolic time. Ch. xxviii. 18–20 is one of the latest parts, which cannot be put into the age of the apostles because it has an incipient Trinity.

The Gentile Christian or Pauline part is often made to subserve the general purpose of showing that Jesus is the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament, and that the main incidents of his life are foreshadowed there. The revisers' advanced views cannot be mistaken. Jesus is the Saviour not only of the Jews but of the Gentiles; and the heathen world pays him its homage. The covenant people are to be rejected for their opposition to the Son of God.

We shall illustrate these prominent characteristics of the gospel at greater length.

(*a.*) The gospel has a more Jewish aspect than any other of the synoptics. This is not owing wholly to the Aramæan basis, for Jewish Christian revisers would naturally retain its primitive complexion in the additions and changes they made. But it is unnecessary to attempt a separation of the elements belonging to the groundwork and those of which the Jewish Christian redactors were the authors.

Jewish nationality is most observable in xv. 24, where Jesus says that he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; in x. 5, where the twelve apostles are forbidden to go among the Gentiles or the Samaritans; and in xix. 28, where the twelve are promised twelve thrones, on which to sit as assessors along with the Messiah, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. The same tendency also appears in the genealogy that reaches up only to Abraham; in the undue stress laid upon works of the law (xii. 33–37; xix. 17); in the exaggerated sanctification of the sabbath (xxiv. 20); the pre-eminence given to Peter (x. 2; xvi. 17–19); Jesus's being styled King of the Jews (ii. 2); the local and temporal modifications of the second advent (x. 23; xvi. 28), and the eschatology generally which makes the end of Israel synchronous with that of the present world (xxiv. 3, 22; x. 23); the regeneration of the twelve tribes being the object of the present dispensation (xix. 28). A literally valid authority is also attributed to the law, under the new dispensation (v. 18, 19). Its significance remains indissoluble; Christianity being a genuine and purified form of Judaism.

(*b.*) As Christianity came to be apprehended in its spirituality and extent, the phases through which the original document passed took off from its Judaism by wider views. Successive additions gave it greater breadth because Christians were gradually arriving at

the conviction that the new religion was intended to embrace Gentiles as well as Jews, and to leaven mankind with higher principles than those embodied in the Old Testament. Hence the present Greek gospel embraces materials of different times and varying character, the separation of which is bound up with the credibility of the narratives. The original Gospel according to the Hebrews must itself have had some non-Judaistic elements, especially where Jesus is the speaker at a certain stage of his ministry, because he enunciated, after a time, a comprehensive religion amid the reserve he adopted. Even in its original form Christianity must have had a principle capable of enlargement. Paul had also preached to the Gentiles before the canonical gospel appeared, and had openly announced a divorce between the old and new religions. Most of the passages where the Gospel presents an ethical universalism belong to a later time, such as that in which we read of the elect being gathered together from the four quarters of heaven, the elect including Jews and Gentiles. But in xv. 21–28, where the heathen woman is praised for her faith, the narrative is original.

The comprehensive character of the gospel is exemplified in xxiv. 14, xxviii. 19, even in opposition to the unbelieving people of promise (viii. 10–12, xx. 1–16, xxii. 1–14). The history of the Canaanite woman exalts the heathen; and Jesus declares that he did not find so great faith in Israel as among them (xv. 28, viii. 10). The curse that should come on the Jewish people (xxvii. 25); the threat that the Kingdom should be taken from them and given to the Gentiles (xxi. 43); the heathen's first salutation of Jesus as King of the Jews (ii. 11–12); the value attached to the moral and religious element of the law (xxii. 40, xxiii. 23), and the history of the birth of Jesus, counterbalance the particularistic element. The principles of the divine Kingdom are said to be unfolded

in the natural way by gradual growth (xiii. 30–33); which is contrary to the passages that depict the closing scene of the present age as near, and inaugurated by the sudden appearance of the Redeemer in his glory (x. 23, xvi. 28, xxiv. 30). In some places, an ascetic influence appears (xix. 12); but in others, the ascetic constraint is represented as adverse to evangelical freedom. Thus the Judaic basis is overshadowed by larger ideas. Ebionite Christianity which was only a development of Judaism receded before liberal conceptions; and the distorted notions entertained of the Founder's person as well as of His teachings, tinged as they were with Judaic crassness, gave place to other beliefs.

2. Another element in the first gospel is its frequent allusion to passages in the Old Testament. The fulfilment of the Old in the New is never lost sight of. It is assumed that the Messianic person and character of Jesus were shadowed forth in the Old Testament. Sometimes the citation is made for the sake of the history to which it is adapted. Thus in i. 22, we read that the birth of Jesus from a virgin took place in order that Isaiah's predictions in vii. 14 might be fulfilled. Micah is said to have foretold his birth in Bethlehem, Matt. ii. 6. Jesus must fly into Egypt that Hosea xi. 1 might be accomplished. Here the history is accommodated to the nature of the citation. When Joseph returned from Egypt with the child and took up his abode in Nazareth, it was that the prophetic saying, 'He shall be called a Nazarene,' might be fulfilled. The same reference to the Old Testament is prominent in the 27th chapter. The evangelist's standpoint is much more in the Old Testament than that of any other synoptist. The Messiahship of Jesus was an object present to his mind, giving rise to the adaptation of old prophecies and parallels to recent events.

3. The arrangement of materials in the gospel is generally regular. Although time does not appear to

have been a leading principle, it is commonly observed. This is observable from the fact that it is commonly noticed *at what time or on what day* an event happened or a discourse was held. Indications of time are either general, *in those days* (iii. 1) ; *at that time* (xi. 25 ; xii. 1 ; xiv. 1) ; or special, such as *in that day* (xiii. 1 ; xviii. 1 ; xxii. 23) ; *after six days* (xvii. 1) ; *while he spake these things* (ix. 18 ; xii. 46) ; *as they went out* (ix. 32) ; *as they departed* (xi. 7) ; *when he was come into the temple* (xxi. 23). To the latter belong the transition-phrases, *when Jesus heard that John was delivered up* (iv. 12) ; *when he was come down from the mountain* (viii. 1) ; *when he entered into Capernaum* (viii. 5) ; *when he came into the house* (viii. 14) ; *passing thence*, etc. etc. The usual particle of transition is *then*,[1] which occurs ninety times. Chronological arrangement is therefore the rule ; nor could any other gospel be taken as the basis of a harmony with so much propriety. The grouping together of various sayings and facts has interfered but little with the proper sequence ; so that arrangement according to subject-matter and to chronological succession, harmonise. Indeed the notices of time often interrupt the flow and thread of the narrative, showing that they were an object of attention to the writer. Thus the story of the magi is introduced by the words, 'Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea,' as though nothing had been said before about the birth of Jesus. The beginnings of sections have usually notices of time, often in connection with place. Hence we hold that the natural order is commonly observed. It must be admitted, however, that the proper succession is not attended to universally. But the exceptions prove the rule, so that Bishop Marsh, following Eichhorn, was right in preferring Matthew's order to Luke's or Mark's, though the basis on which he grounds it is the incautious statement that the apostle,

[1] τότε.

being an eyewitness of the facts recorded, must have known the time in which each of them happened; a statement applicable at most to the Aramæan groundwork, but necessarily incorrect in relation to the canonical gospel.

### LEADING OBJECT.

The leading object of the final redactor has been anticipated in the preceding paragraph. It has been said that he was influenced by a Judaising tendency, which is correct in a certain sense. It was certainly not his intention to portray the kingly character of Christ; nor is the tone throughout kingly and majestic, as has been said. The evangelist is as far as possible from looking at things in a grand, general aspect, indifferent to details; or from sacrificing both time and place to groups of discourses, parables, or miracles. Simplicity is observable in the work, not grandeur, while time and place are sacrificed less than in the other synoptics.

The general purport of the original work was to show that Jesus was the Messiah promised to the Jews. It had a didactic purpose, viz. to strengthen Jewish Christianity. Christ is set forth, not in opposition to the Mosaic law, but as establishing its legitimate claims and bringing out its true meaning. His doctrine is set above the Pharisaic apprehension of the law, not above its proper signification. This design appears in the quotations from the Old Testament, and in the turn given to parts of the old history that they may suit the life of Jesus. Former events are typical of later ones and repeated, such as the sojourn in Egypt, the exodus, and the Sinaitic legislation. It cannot be denied, therefore, that the historical narrative is sometimes shaped by a writer who regards the ministry of Jesus as meant for his own people. In conformity with this design, the discourses show a preference for what relates to the Jews and their law. The gospel exhibits a Christianity

springing out of Judaism as a divine system testifying to the Messiah who should redeem his people. The work was not written at first in the interest of a Jewish Christian party distinct from Christians of a freer tendency, but in their interest when they were themselves of the Church. It was meant for the use of the Jewish Christians generally, to promote their faith. The writer shows them that the Messiah had come, that the prophetic Scriptures were fulfilled in Jesus, and that they should emancipate themselves from traditional interpretations of the law. Jesus assumes an attitude of hostility to the scribes and Pharisees, to the chief priests and Sadducees, confronting and refuting their traditions; but he never denounces the law itself. As the gospel is a growth, not a homogeneous composition, it is not pervaded by one tendency alone. Successive revisers widened it for a larger circle of readers ; and the final redactor interwove liberal among Ebionite statements, so that Pauline mingling with Petrine elements have modified the original Ebionism.

### TIME OF WRITING.

The question as to the time when the gospel was written hardly admits of a definite answer, because of the way in which the work originated. Matthew wrote the substance in Aramæan ; that was translated into Greek, and received additions, modifications, and changes, till it took the present form, the Greek canonical gospel. Hence the indications of time, if such there be, are different. Some belong to the original and are therefore early ; others proceeding from revisers are late. A work which attained its present state by various steps cannot exhibit conclusive evidence of a single date.

It is probable that Matthew wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem. Irenæus testifies that the gospel originated after A.D. 60 and before A.D. 70, ' when Peter

and Paul were preaching and founding the church in Rome.' But Peter did not lay the foundation of the church in Rome; for it had been planted nine or ten years before. Bishop Marsh thinks that the verb *to found*,[1] as used by Irenæus, means no more than *to build up* or *confirm*, not to lay the first foundation; which is contrary to the obvious sense. The testimony of Irenæus is precarious. Though he belonged to the second century, and had better means of knowing the truth than succeeding writers, his statements must be judged by their inherent probability. He is so far correct as to make the apostle write after A.D. 60 and before the destruction of Jerusalem. Various parts of the gospel which presuppose the existence of the life of the people in Palestine (viii. 4; x. 23; xxiii. 2), etc., and of the temple-worship (v. 23; xvii. 24–27; xxiii. 16, etc., 21), agree with this.

The 24th chapter has been appealed to more than any other part in determining the date of the gospel. But the exegetical difficulties belonging to it detract from the weight of its evidence. That the prophecy refers to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus is clear, notwithstanding Baur's opinion. Three particulars are observable, *the beginning of sorrows*, *the actual destruction of the city and temple*, and *the return of the Messiah in glory*. The last is said to be *soon after*[2] the destruction of Jerusalem, which creates perplexity, especially in connection with the thirtieth verse. So does the word *generation* in the thirty-fourth verse,—which must be referred to the contemporaries of Jesus; not to a period of about 100 years, as Baur and others understand it. The general description shows that it was written at the commencement of the disasters which befell the Jewish nation and terminated in its downfall, i.e. between A.D. 66 and 70. The section embracing verses 4–35, can hardly be earlier than A.D. 67. Amid the calamities

[1] θεμελιόω. [2] εὐθέως.

connected with the destruction of the metropolis, the signs of the Messiah's coming here given, false Messiahs, earthquakes, disastrous wars, persecutions causing many Christians to apostatise, did not occur, but are projected backward from a later period. They are even put into the mouth of Jesus as predictions.

There is an expression twice used in the gospel, *until this day* (xxvii. 8 ; xxviii. 15), implying a considerable interval between the event and its record ; how long it is impossible to tell, probably twenty years.

In addition to other notices, some refer to xxiii. 35, identifying Zechariah there mentioned with Zechariah son of Baruch, who was slain in the temple about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, as Josephus relates. But others, supposing that the true reading is what the gospel of the Hebrews had, 'Zacharias son of Joiada,' identify him with the Zechariah mentioned in the last book of the Jewish canon (2 Chronicles xxiv. 19–24).

These and other internal marks do not fix the exact date of the present Greek gospel. The words of Papias imply that it was in circulation before he wrote, though he did not rely upon it, thinking that the Greek had almost suppressed the authentic Matthew, and therefore choosing to trust to oral tradition for 'what Matthew said.' The baptismal formula points to a late time, even to the beginning of the second century. And xvi. 18, 19, probably indicate a later date than 67 A.D. ; for though the verses are of a strongly Jewish type, the word *church*, and the hyperbolical terms employed in giving the apostle Peter spiritual power, suggest a time when the Jewish Christians had witnessed the extensive growth of Paulinism and were embittered against it. The noun *church* which the Ebionites avoided, is transferred from Paulinism to Petrinism. It does not occur in the other gospels, and is employed in its posterior sense of *the church universal*. Cremer's Lexicon inverts the right order of its meanings. In like manner xviii.

17 and its context presuppose an ecclesiastical organisation posterior to the overthrow of Judaism.

If we could tell the precise dates of the epistles of Barnabas and Clemens Romanus, we come near the truth. The epistle of Clement does not recognise the existence of the gospel, as we see from its citations. If it were written, as Köstlin supposes, between A.D. 90 and 96, the gospel would be later. But that date is not established; as is evident from the fact that Volkmar makes it A.D. 125. The epistle of Barnabas clearly recognises the gospel's existence,[1] since there is an allusion to Matt. xx. 16, in the fourth chapter; but there is a peculiarity about this quotation which neutralises the evidence it would otherwise give. The epistle was written A.D. 119. The gospel may be dated about 105 A.D.

The place where the Aramæan appeared was Judea, where the Greek also originated.

### STYLE AND DICTION.

The language of the gospel is more Hebraic than that of the other three, which accords with the fact of its ultimate derivation from an Aramæan original.

1. The usual formula prefixed to passages cited from the Old Testament to prove the Messiahship of Jesus is, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet' (i. 22; ii. 15); which is usually abbreviated or varied in later chapters (ii. 17; iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 35; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56; xxvii. 9). The formula τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα κ.τ.λ. is particularly deserving of notice (i. 22; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56). In these and similar citations, the expressions ῥηθείς, ῥηθέν, ἐρρήθη (διά) nineteen times, are peculiar to Matthew.

2. The expression 'Son of David' is applied to Jesus eight times. In Mark and Luke it is less frequent.

[1] Comp. c. v. with Matt. ix. 13, xxvi. 13; c. xix. with Matt. xix. 19.

3. Jerusalem is called 'the holy city' and 'the holy place' (iv. 5 ; xxiv. 15 ; xxvii. 53).

4. The phrase *συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*, *end of the age* or *dispensation*, occurs five times. The only other example of a similar phrase is in the epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 26).

5. 'Kingdom of heaven' is a favourite expression of the gospel, as it occurs thirty-two times. The other synoptists have *kingdom of God* instead. The latter, however, occurs in Matt. xii. 28 ; xxi. 31, 43.

6. 'Heavenly Father' is used five times ; and 'Father in heaven,' sixteen times.

7. *κατ' ὄναρ* occurs six times.

8. *προσέρχεσθαι* and *πορεύεσθαι* are used in the oriental manner, by way of expanding a discourse (iv. 3 ; viii. 5, 19, 25 ; ix. 14, 20 ; xiii. 10, 27, 36, etc., ii. 9 ; ix. 13 ; xi. 4 ; xvii. 27, etc.). The former occurs fifty-one times ; but in Mark it is used only six times, and in Luke ten times.

9. *σφόδρα* is always put after a verb (ii. 10 ; xvii. 6, 23 ; xviii. 31 ; xix. 25 ; xxvi. 22 ; xxvii. 54). It occurs but once in Mark and in Luke.

10. *τότε* is the usual particle of transition. It occurs ninety-one times ; but only six times in Mark, and fourteen in Luke.

11. *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε* (vii. 28 ; xi. 1 ; xiii. 53 ; xix. 1 ; xxvi. 1). Luke has *ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο*, *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο*.

12. *ἕως οὗ* occurs seven times. Luke has oftener *ἕως ὅτου*.

13. *ποιεῖν ὡς*, *ὥσπερ*, *ὡσαύτως*, *καθώς* commonly with *προσέταξεν* or the like (i. 24 ; vi. 2 ; xx. 5 ; xxi. 6 ; xxvi. 19 ; xxviii. 15). Luke employs *ποιεῖν ὁμοίως* and other expressions.

14. *τάφος* occurs six times. The other evangelists never use it, but either *μνῆμα* or *μνημεῖον*, the latter being also in Matthew.

15. *συμβούλιον λαβεῖν* (xii. 14; xxii. 15; xxvii. 1, 7; xxviii. 12).

16. *ἰδού* after a genitive absolute occurs nine times. In introducing something new, *καὶ ἰδού* is employed.

17. Adverbs are usually put after the imperative. *οὕτως* is an exception.

18. *προσκυνεῖν* takes the dative case ten times, the accusative but once. Mark also has the dative; Luke and John oftener the accusative.

19. *ὀμνύω εἰς* or *ἐν* is a Hebraism not used by the other evangelists.

20. *λέγων* frequently occurs without the dative of a person; vii. 21, is an exception.

21. *Ἱεροσόλυμα* is always the name of Jerusalem, except in xxiii. 37.

22. *ὁ λεγόμενος* is a favourite expression in announcing names or surnames, being used of Christ (i. 16; xxvii. 17, 22), of Matthew (ix. 9), of Peter (iv. 18; x. 2), of Caiaphas (xxvi. 3), of Iscariot (xxvi. 14), and also of names of places (ii. 23; xxvi. 36; xxvii. 33).

23. 'Now the birth of Jesus was thus' (i. 18); 'now the names of the twelve apostles are these' (x. 2), introduce sentences peculiar to the gospel.

24. *εἰπεῖν τι κατά τινος*, v. 11; xii. 32.

25. Matthew prefers adding 'of the people' to the *scribes* or *elders*, ii. 4; xxi. 23; xxvi. 3, 47; xxvii. 1, to which there is some approach in *οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ* (Luke xix. 47), and *τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ* (Luke xxii. 66).

26. *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, x. 41, 42; xviii. 20; xxviii. 19. The other evangelists have *ἐν* and *ἐπί*.

27. *πᾶς ὅστις*, vii. 24; x. 32; xix. 29. Luke has *πᾶς ὅς*.

28. *ἀκούσω* for *ἀκούσομαι*, xii. 19; xiii. 14, 15.

29. *μέχρι τῆς σήμερον*, xi. 23; xxviii. 15, and *ἕως τῆς σήμερον*, xxvii. 8, peculiar to Matthew.

30. *οὗτος γὰρ* is peculiar to Matthew iii. 3; vii. 12;

xi. 10. Luke has *κατὰ ταῦτα γάρ* twice, and *ἅπαντες γὰρ οὗτοι* once, while Mark has *εἰς τοῦτο γάρ*; but neither has *οὗτος γάρ*. Similarly *οὕτως γάρ* is peculiar to Matthew: ii. 5; iii. 15; v. 12.

31. The preposition *ἀπό* is a favourite with Matthew, even after verbs with which other New Testament writers connect *ἐκ*, as after *ἐγείρεσθαι* (xiv. 2; xxvii. 64; xxviii. 7), and *διεγείρεσθαι* (i. 24).

32. Verbs in *εὐειν* are favourites with Matthew, as *μαθητεύειν, δεσμεύειν, ἐπιγαμβρεύειν, παγιδεύειν, ἀγγαρεύειν*, etc.

33. *ἀναχωρεῖν* occurs ten times; in Mark but once, and only three times in the New Testament besides.

34. *ἐπάνω* nine times. Mark has it but once; Luke five times.

35. *ἡγεμών* ten times. Mark has it once and Luke twice.

36. *ὅπως* eighteen times. In Mark twice, in Luke seven times.

37. *συνάγειν* twenty-four times. In Mark five times and in Luke seven.

38. *ὕστερον* seven times. Mark has it once and Luke twice.

39. *θρόνιμος* seven times. Luke has it twice.

40. The following are peculiar to the gospel: *ἀγγεῖον, ἄγκιστρον, ἀθῷος, αἷμα δίκαιον, αἱμορρόεῖν, αἱρετίζειν, ἀκμήν, ἀκριβοῦν, ἀναβιβάζειν, ἀναίτιος, ἄνηθον, ἀπονίπτειν, ἀργύρια* (plural), *ἄρτι, Βάρ, βασανιστής, βαττολογεῖν, βιαστής, δάνειον, ὁ δεῖνα, δέσμη, διακωλύειν, διαλλάττεσθαι, διασαφεῖν, δίδραχμον, διέξοδος, διετής, διστάζειν, διυλίζειν, διχάζειν, διψᾶν, ἑβδομηκοντάκις, ἔγερσις, ἐγὼ κύριε, ἐθνικός, εἰδέα, εἰρηνοποιός, ἐκλάμπειν, ἐμμανουήλ, ἐμπορία, ἐμπρήθειν, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ἐξορκίζειν, ἐξώτερος, ἐπικαθίζειν, ἐπισπείρειν, ἐρεύγεσθαι, ἐρίφιον, ἑταῖρος, εὐδία, εὐνοεῖν, εὐνουχίζειν, εὐρύχωρος, ζιζάνια, θαυμάσιος, θεέ* (vocative), *θηριστής, θησαυροί* (plural elsewhere only in Hebrews xi. 26), *θυμοῦσθαι, ἰῶτα, καθη-*

γητής, καταθεματίζειν, καταμανθάνειν, καταποντίζεσθαι, κῆτος, κόλασις (elsewhere only in 1 John iv. 18), κουστωδία, κρυφαῖος, κύμινον, κώνωψ, μεταίρειν, μαλακίαι, μαθητεύειν, μεταμέλεσθαι, μετοικεσία, μισθοῦσθαι, μύλων, νόμισμα, νυστάζειν (also in 2 Peter ii. 3), οἰκετεία, οἰκιακός, οὐδαμῶς, παγιδεύειν, παραθαλάσσιος, παρακούειν, παρομοιάζειν, παρουσία, παροψίς, πέλαγος (only in Acts xxvii. 5 besides), πλατύς, πολυλογία, πρᾶος, προσφέρειν δῶρον, προφθάνειν, πυρράζειν, ῥακά, ραπίζειν, σαγήνη, σείειν, σεληνιάζεσθαι, σιτιστός, σμύρνα, στατήρ, συναίρειν λόγον, συνάντησις, συναυξάνεσθαι, συντάττειν, τάλαντον, ταφή, τελευτή, τηροῦντες *a watch*, τραπεζίτης, τρύπημα, φράζειν, φυλακτήριον, φυτεία, χαλεπός, χλαμύς, χρυσός, ψευδομαρτυρία, ψύχεσθαι.[1]

## QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

| | |
|---|---|
| †i. 23 | Isaiah vii. 14. |
| *ii. 6 | Micah v. i. |
| †ii. 15 | Hosea xi. 1. |
| †ii. 18 | Jeremiah xxxi. 15. |
| *iii. 3 | Isaiah xl. 3, &c. |
| *iv. 4 | Deuteronomy viii. 3 |
| *iv. 6 | Psalm xci. 11, 12. |
| *iv. 7 | Deuteronomy vi. 16. |
| *iv. 10 | Deuteronomy vi. 13. |
| †iv. 15, 16 | Isaiah ix. 1, 2. |
| *v. 5 | Psalm xxxvii. 11. |
| *v. 21 | Exodus xx. 13. |
| v. 27 | Exodus xx. 14. |
| †*v. 31 | Deuteronomy xxiv. 1. |
| †*v. 33 | Levit. xix. 12; Deut. xxiii. 23. |
| *v. 38 | Exodus xxi. 24. |
| *v. 43 | Leviticus xix. 18. |
| viii. 4 | Leviticus xiv. 12. |
| †viii. 17 | Isaiah liii. 4. |
| *ix. 13 | Hosea vi. 6. |
| x. 35, 36 | Micah vii. 6. |
| xi. 5 | Isaiah xxxv. 5; xxix. 18. |
| *xi. 10 | Malachi iii. 1. |
| xi. 14 | Malachi iv. 5. |
| xii. 3 | 1 Samuel xxi. 6. |
| xii. 7 | Hosea vi. 6. |
| †xii. 17-21 | Isaiah xlii. 1–4. |

[1] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, by Zeller, vol. ii. p. 445, *et seq.*

| | |
|---|---|
| xii. 40 | Jonah i. 17. |
| xii. 42 | 1 Kings x. 1. |
| *xiii. 14, 15 | Isaiah vi. 9. |
| †xiii. 35 | Psalm lxxviii. 2. |
| *xv. 4 | Exodus xx. 12, and xxi. 17. |
| *xv. 8, 9 | Isaiah xxix. 13. |
| xvii. 2 | Exodus xxxiv. 29. |
| xvii. 11 | Malachi iii. 1; iv. 5. |
| xviii. 16 | Deuteronomy xix. 15. |
| xix. 4 | Genesis i. 27. |
| *xix. 5 | Genesis ii. 24. |
| *xix. 7 | Deuteronomy xxiv. 1. |
| *xix. 18 | Exodus xx. 12, &c. |
| xix. 19 | Leviticus xix. 18. |
| †xxi. 5 | Zechariah ix. 9. |
| xxi. 9 | Psalm cxviii. 25, 26. |
| *xxi. 13 | Isaiah lvi. 7; Jeremiah vii. 11. |
| *xxi. 16 | Psalm viii. 3. |
| *xxi. 42 | Psalm cxviii. 22, 23. |
| *xxii. 24 | Deuteronomy xxv. 5. |
| *xxii. 32 | Exodus iii. 6, 16. |
| *xxii. 37 | Deuteronomy vi. 5. |
| *xxii. 39 | Leviticus xix. 18. |
| *xxii. 44 | Psalm cx. 1. |
| *xxiii. 38 | Psalm lxix. 25. |
| *xxiii. 39 | Psalm cxviii. 26. |
| *xxiv. 15 | Daniel ix. 27. |
| xxiv. 29 | Isaiah xiii. 10. |
| *xxvi. 31 | Zechariah xiii. 7. |
| xxvi. 64 | Daniel vii. 13. |
| †xxvii. 9, 10 | Zechariah xi. 13. |
| xxvii. 35 | Psalm xxii. 19. |
| xxvii. 43 | Psalm xxii. 8. |
| xxvii. 46 | Psalm xxii. 1. |

The citations marked thus (†) are of the first class referred to by Bleek, in which the evangelist indicates the fulfilment of Old Testament statements, and cites independently of the LXX from the Hebrew text; departing in most instances not only from the words but the sense of the Greek version. Those marked thus (*) belong to the second class, in which the LXX are mostly followed, either verbally even where they deviate from the original as in iii. 3, xiii. 14, etc., or with a freedom which did not arise from consulting the Hebrew.

Three of the first class correspond exactly to the Hebrew text, viz. ii. 15 ; viii. 17 ; xiii. 35. Four refer mainly to the Hebrew, but show a partial influence of the LXX upon them—ii. 18 ; iv. 15 ; xii. 17–21 ; xxi. 5. One agrees with the Septuagint, i. 23. Few of the second class show any dependence on the Hebrew. xi. 10 corresponds to the original ; ii. 6 shows a predominating influence of the same ; and xxii. 24 exhibits a subordinate influence in the use of a verb.

Some of the citations cannot be properly placed in either class, owing to their peculiarities or generality. This is not surprising in the case of those interwoven with the sermon on the mount, such as v. 31, 33, because they are not taken from the law but from Pharisaic tradition.

The citation from *the prophets* in ii. 23, seems to allude not only to Isai. xi. 1 but also to Jerem. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15 ; Zech. iii. 8 ; vi. 12. There is a double meaning in the epithet *Nazarene*, *the sprout* or *branch* and *of Nazareth*. The evangelist indulges in a Jewish midrash, which has a mystical sense beneath the obvious one.

The canon of Bleek respecting the quotations does not hold good in all instances. It is not correct to say, that all those which result from the evangelist's own reflection are taken from the Hebrew ; neither is it true that such as are inserted into the context of the narrative are uniformly from the Septuagint. i. 23 is an exception to the former, being from the LXX ; and xxii. 24 an exception to the latter, being from the Hebrew. ii. 6, which has reference to the Hebrew, is also an exception to the rule. The influence of the Septuagint is not always absent from the citations of the original, though it is comparatively small. But notwithstanding the exceptions taken to the classification by Ebrard and Delitzsch, it is substantially a sound one. In the first

class, seven agree more or less closely with the Hebrew, and only two with the LXX ; in the second class, there are three gradational exceptions to derivation from the LXX, which is not surprising in a list more numerous than the first.

# THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

## THE REPUTED AUTHOR.

THE REPUTED author of the third gospel is *Luke*,[1] the name being an abbreviated form of *Lukanus*,[2] in the same manner as *Silas* is formed from *Silvanus*. Paul mentions Luke the beloved physician, who is commonly identified with the evangelist; at least, the fathers generally—Eusebius, Jerome, Chrysostom—identify them; and most modern critics do the same. Some have even discovered indications of the writer's profession in the Gospel and Acts; such as the expression *a great fever*, which Galen uses (iv. 38); and a technical term[3] denoting *blindness* (Acts xiii. 11), which is also employed by Galen. Other technical expressions have been discovered, which are imaginary. The two are themselves doubtful.

Little is known of Luke's history before he became associated with the apostle of the Gentiles. Lardner thinks he was a Jew, for two reasons, neither of which is satisfactory. It is more likely that be was a Gentile, if we may judge from Coloss. iv. 11, 14, where the writer, having saluted certain persons by name, adds that they were of the circumcision; separating them from those mentioned afterwards, among whom is Luke. It has been assumed that he was a manumitted slave, probably because the Greeks and Romans were accus-

[1] Λουκᾶς. [2] Λουκανός. [3] ἀχλύς.

tomed to educate some of their domestics in the science of medicine, and granted them freedom for services performed. But the fact of Luke's being a physician, does not imply that he was a manumitted slave.

Nothing is known of his native place, or of the locality in which he resided before he attached himself to Paul. Greswell conjectures that he was a native or inhabitant of Philippi; others prefer Troas. According to Eusebius he was born in Antioch; and this is confirmed by Augustine. As his name is a Greek one, he was probably a Greek; and therefore the inhabitants of his native city were Greeks.

Luke, as is generally believed, attached himself to Paul at Troas, while the latter was on his second missionary journey. We afterwards find him at Philippi. Towards the end of the apostle's third missionary tour, Luke was with him at Troas, Miletus, Tyre, Cæsarea, Jerusalem. At Cæsarea, where Paul was a prisoner, his faithful friend did not desert him; for although he may not have accompanied him thither, he probably followed (Acts xxiv. 23), and was with him towards the close of his confinement. It is certain that he accompanied him to Rome.

The latter part of Luke's life is involved in obscurity; and the accounts given of it by ecclesiastical writers are neither consistent nor probable. According to Epiphanius and others he was one of the 72 disciples, and preached in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy and Macedonia. Theophylact makes him one of the two disciples who journeyed to Emmaus; while Nicephorus speaks of him as a painter, who painted Christ and his mother. The Apostolic Constitutions mention his presence at Alexandria. Isidore of Seville relates that he died in the seventy-fourth year of his age, was buried in Bithynia, and that his bones were subsequently conveyed to Constantinople. Some put him in the list of martyrs; others say he died a natural death.

PREFACE OF THE GOSPEL.

Unlike the other evangelists Luke gives a preface from which we learn—

1. The qualifications which the author possessed for writing a gospel. He had traced up all things to their sources *accurately*. He had the gospels of many before him. In addition to these, he had an immediate oral tradition, as his predecessors had. Written and oral sources of the evangelical history were at his disposal. It is not indeed expressly stated in the proem, that Luke drew his materials from the gospels of the many, either wholly or in part; but it is natural to suppose that he would employ them; since they contained true and valuable matter. As he had traced up everything to its source, he starts from an earlier point than the other synoptists.

2. The mode in which he proposes to write is stated, viz. *in order*. What kind of order? Probably the *chronological*. Such order, however, he has not always followed. If it is said that the adverb does not mean chronological order, but only a connected plan, an orderly arrangement, not a chronological sequence of the matters narrated, this is refuted by the section ix. 51–xviii. 14, whose constituent parts betray no proper arrangement; so that harmonists are obliged to distribute them among the transactions of different times and places, transferring them to conjectural positions from their having all the appearance of a disconnected collection. No plan can be discovered in the portions that make up the ection. If it be said that ix. 51–xviii. 14 was taken from a written document and simply inserted by the evangelist, that does not meet the case, because the section has no real relation to what is immediately before it; neither has xviii. 15 any perceptible connec-

tion with its preceding context. And if the evangelist had regard to any order he could hardly fail to see that x. 1–16 follows ix. 51, etc. awkwardly, because the seventy were instructed and sent out before Jesus's departure to Jerusalem and the incidents in Samaria that preceded his arrival. These considerations compel us to abide by the natural meaning, involving as it does chronological sequence; and to conclude that the gospel as it appears is not identical with that which the preface-writer introduced.

3. Many had attempted to fix in writing the oral evangelical tradition, before Luke. These evangelists had even drawn from persons who were 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,' i.e. apostles and disciples. Who they were is not specified.

4. It has been generally supposed since the time of Origen, that blame is implied in the word translated *taken in hand*. But it is doubtful whether it involves censure; though along with the context some dissatisfaction with the writers may be conveyed. Notwithstanding they derived their materials from 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,' and may therefore have been supposed to write, if not complete at least accurate and chronological gospels, this evangelist was not satisfied, but wishes to give Theophilus a *truthful* or *credible* gospel.[1] Hence the works of the *many* were not infallibly truthful or credible, in Luke's opinion. They are tacitly charged with failure, both in the contents and form of their gospels.

5. The preface obviously implies that the evangelist was not an original eyewitness. Hence he was not of the seventy disciples. The author of the Dialogue *de recta in Deum fide*, is therefore mistaken in characterising Luke as one of them.

Other deductions from the preface will be noticed hereafter. Meantime we observe in the writer of the

[1] ἀσφάλεια.

third gospel a critical historian, who feels impelled to undertake a gospel which would represent apostolic tradition more faithfully than had been done before. Not satisfied with former digests, he proposes to produce a better, one reaching up to an earlier period, chronological and trustworthy.

### SOURCES.

The gospel of Matthew certainly preceded that of Luke. It is therefore probable that the evangelist would use it. But *à priori* reasoning on the point is precarious. Internal evidence should be looked at. And such evidence shows that the first gospel was one source at least whence Luke drew his materials. The resemblance between certain portions of the respective documents could not have been accidental. It is so close and even verbal as to admit of but one explanation, viz. that Luke used either Matthew, or a document which Matthew employed. It has been urged against the former hypothesis, that a writer acquainted with a genealogy in which Jesus is made to proceed from the royal line of David, could hardly have believed in the existence of a better one; but it is not necessary to suppose that Luke thought he could furnish a better, much less that he was unacquainted with the genealogy given by Matthew, as Wittichen supposes. He may have thought of giving one more accordant with his view of Christianity. In the time of the third evangelist, we suppose that the *Logia-document* had been supplanted by the first gospel, or that it no longer existed in its original state; and it is surely improbable that he would employ it rather than the present Greek Matthew. Holtzmann and others would represent Luke as using the *Logia-document* after the present canonical Matthew had appeared, which is very unlikely, especially when we remember that it existed in a Greek

paraphrase enlarged and modified out of its Aramæan state. If we reflect that Luke had a variety of sources or gospels at his command, and that when he wrote the present gospel of Matthew existed, it is natural to think that he did not neglect either the *Logia*-document or the canonical Greek. The evidences of their employment are few, because he had many documents from which to draw his materials, and occupied a different standpoint from that of the first evangelist. If it be conceded that he used the principal source of Matthew's gospel, why should it be thought incredible that he employed the gospel itself, provided it had already appeared? Examples of coincidence appear in Luke vii. 22, 23, compared with Matt. xi. 4–6; vii. 28 with Matt. xi. 11; Luke iii. 7, 8, with Matt. iii. 7–9; Luke xi. 24–26, with Matt. xii. 43–45; Luke vii. 8–9 with Matt. viii. 9–10.

| MATTHEW. | LUKE. |
|---|---|
| Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. | Then Jesus answering said unto them, Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached. |
| And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me (xi. 4, 5, 6). | And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me (vii. 22, 23). |
| Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist, but he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he (xi. 11). | For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist; but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he (vii. 28). |
| O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance. And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham (iii. 7–9). | O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance; and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham (iii. 7, 8). |

MATTHEW.

When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house whence I came out; and when he is come he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first (xii. 43–45).

For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. When Jesus heard he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel (viii. 9, 10).

LUKE.

When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none he saith, I will return into my house whence I came out; and when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first (xi. 24–26).

For I am a man set under authority, having soldiers under me; and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth, and to another Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. When Jesus heard these things he marvelled at him, and turned him about and said to the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel (vii. 8, 9).

The use of the first gospel is confirmed by the discourses and sayings recorded in Luke more than by the actions and events narrated. Though the divergencies are numerous in the distribution and plan, as well as in the matter itself, it is clear that the first gospel was employed directly by the writer of the third. Thus the sayings of Jesus in Luke vii. 31–35 are closely related to Matt. xi. 16–19, the deviations being inconsiderable. So too Luke xii. compared with Matt. x. The deviation in xii. 3, 'whatsoever ye *have spoken* in darkness *shall be heard* in the light, and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-tops,' finds its explanation in the fact that Christianity had already spread in Luke's time; so that the secret doctrine taught by our Lord to his immediate disciples, referred to in Matt. x. 27, did not appear to suit the advanced state of religion. Luke's horizon is wider

than that of the first evangelist who confines himself to the operations of the twelve. He looks at the accomplishment of the words of Jesus on an extended scale because the fact was before his eyes; whereas Matthew's view is restricted.

The first gospel was not the only source which Luke employed, as the word *many* in his proem suggests. He had Jewish documents besides. This is seen in the sermon on the mount. 'Blessed be ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God,' varies remarkably from Matthew's, 'Blessed are *the poor in spirit*;' reminding one of James's expressions, 'Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?' Here Luke presents the original Essene expression. The words in xvii. 4 appear to be taken from the Gospel of the Hebrews; and the history of the resurrection in the third gospel is closely related to that of the same document. Both writers used the same source, or one took from the other. In whatever way tradition contributed to the materials of Luke, we see clearly that it was not the Galilean one which Matthew followed. Thus the two unimportant events noticed in xiii. 1–4, which happened at Jerusalem, betray a writer who was well acquainted with at least the former of them. And in the narrative of the resurrection, not a word is said of Jesus's appearance in Galilee, though Matt. xxviii. and 1 Cor. xv. imply that he was seen there by many. On the contrary, the disciples were to wait at Jerusalem till the Spirit should be poured out (Luke xxiv. 49).

It is difficult at the present day to determine the nature or number of the documents which Luke employed. Were they comprehensive works such as we now term *gospels*; or were they small collections, detached pieces of history? The former opinion seems to us more probable; though Ewald, who adopts it, assumes too many Gospels, Ebionite and Gnostic ones of different

kinds. The subject does not admit of a satisfactory explanation. It may be inferred from a minute survey of the contents, that Luke employed the Gospel according to the Hebrews in one of its early forms, and the so-called Gospel of St. Peter, from which he drew the greater part of his materials relating to the events and actions of Jesus's life. He had not much Galilean tradition at his command; and therefore the ministry of Christ in northern Judea is rapidly surveyed with the aid of Matthew's gospel (iii. 23–ix. 50). The facts narrated relate more to southern Judea and Jerusalem.

Among the sources of information which Luke employed, it has been thought that Josephus was one, both in his 'Antiquities' and 'History of the Jewish War.' Some coincidences in expression have been pointed out by Holtzmann which appear at first sight to favour the idea.[1] But they are not sufficient to justify it, least of all in the gospel. And even the Acts do not support it, though the passage about Theudas bears some resemblance to the parallel narrative of the 'Antiquities.' The mistakes of Luke about Quirinius and Theudas, with his appellation of Philip as tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis, are against his consultation of Josephus's works. The Jewish historian would have obviated these and other errors.

### RELATION OF THE GOSPEL TO THE APOSTLE PAUL.

Luke was the companion of Paul, if not his spiritual son. Hence arose the opinion that the evangelist wrote his gospel under the superintending influence of the apostle—an opinion that existed in the Church at an early period, and was handed down from one generation to another. It is not difficult to account for this indirect derivation of the gospel from Paul. The early fathers appear to have considered apostolic origin in one

[1] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1873, p. 85, etc.

form or other necessary to the reception of a work into the canon; and the transition from a disciple of the apostle to the act of writing under apostolic inspection, was natural. Hence Luke's gospel was thought to convey Paul's sentiments.

The tradition respecting the connection between the third gospel and Paul is embodied in the following passages. The Muratorian fragment says: 'Luke the physician, after the ascension of Christ, when Paul had taken him for a companion as being zealous of what was right, wrote in his own name according as it seemed good to him,' etc.[1] Irenæus writes: 'And Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel preached by him (Paul).'[2] In another place: 'That Luke was inseparable from Paul, and his fellow-labourer in the gospel is shown by himself,' etc. . . . . 'Thus, the apostles simply, and without envying any one, handed down to all those things which they themselves had learned from the Lord. So therefore Luke also, without envy to any one, has handed down to us those things which he had learned from them, as he testifies when he says, "even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word."'[3]

Tertullian says: 'In the first place, we lay it down as a truth, that the evangelic Scriptures have for their authors the apostles, to whom the work of publishing the gospel was committed by the Lord himself. And if it have for authors apostolic men, they are not alone

[1] 'Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi, cum eum Paulus quasi ut juris studiosum secundum adsumsisset, nomine suo ex opinione conscripsit,' etc.

[2] Λουκᾶς δὲ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο.—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 1, p. 845, ed. Migne.

[3] 'Quoniam autem is Lucas inseparabilis fuit a Paulo, et coöperarius ejus in evangelio, ipse facit manifestum,' etc. . . . . 'Sic Apostoli simpliciter, et nemini invidentes, quæ didicerant, ipsi a Domino, hæc omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas, nemini invidens, ea quæ ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testificatur, dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et ministri fuerunt verbi.'—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 14, § 1, 2, pp. 913–915, ed. Migne.

but with apostles and after apostles, since the preaching of the disciples might have been suspected of the charge of a desire of glory, if not supported by the authority of the masters, yea of Christ, who made the apostles masters. . . . . Therefore if Luke's instructor himself (Paul) wished to have the authority of his predecessors both for his faith and preaching, how much more may I desire for Luke's gospel, what was necessary for the gospel of his master.'[1]

In another place Tertulian has these words: 'Luke's digest is usually ascribed to Paul. It is easy to take for the master's what the disciples have published.'[2]

Origen writes: 'The third is that according to Luke, the gospel commended by Paul,' etc.[3]

The historian Eusebius has: 'And Luke, who was a native of Antioch, and by profession a physician, a companion of Paul for the most part, and who was not slightly acquainted with the rest of the apostles, has left us, in two books divinely inspired, proofs of the art of healing souls which he got from them. One of these is the gospel, which he professes to have written as they delivered it to him who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, with all of whom he says likewise he had been perfectly acquainted from the beginning. The other book is the Acts of the Apostles, which he composed not from what he had heard, but from what he had seen with his own eyes.

[1] 'Constituimus imprimis evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum; si et apostolicos non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis, et post apostolos, quoniam prædicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloriæ studio, si non adsistat illi autoritas magistrorum, imo Christi, qui magistros apostolos fecit. . . . . Igitur si ipse illuminator Lucæ (Paulus) autoritatem antecessorum et fidei et prædicationi suæ optavit, quanto magis eam evangelio Lucæ expostulem, quæ evangelio magistri ejus fuit necessaria?'—*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 2.

[2] 'Nam et Lucæ digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Capit magistrorum videri quæ discipuli promulgârint.'—*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 2.

[3] *καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον.*—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

And it is said that Paul was accustomed to mention the gospel according to him, whenever in his epistles, speaking as it were of some gospel of his own, he says, "according to my gospel." '[1]

This language implies doubt of the current tradition.

Jerome writes: 'Luke, a physician of Antioch, not unskilled in the Hebrew language, as his writings show, a disciple of the apostle Paul, and the constant companion of his travels, wrote a gospel, of which the same Paul makes mention, saying, 'We have sent with him the brother whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches." . . . Some suppose that whenever Paul in his epistles makes use of the expression *according to my gospel*, he means Luke's writing. It is also supposed that Luke did not learn his gospel from the apostle Paul only, who had not conversed with the Lord in the flesh, but also from other apostles, which he likewise declares in the beginning of his gospel, saying, "As they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." Therefore he wrote the gospel as he heard it from others.'[2]

The tradition before us rests on a precarious basis.

[1] *Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας τὴν δὲ ἐπιστήμην ἰατρός· τὰ πλεῖστα συγγεγονὼς τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡμιληκὼς ἧς ἀπὸ τούτων προσεκτήσατο ψυχῶν θεραπευτικῆς, ἐν δυσὶν ἡμῖν ὑποδείγματα θεοπνεύστοις καταλέλοιπε βιβλίοις· τῷ τε εὐαγγελίῳ ὃ καὶ χαράξαι μαρτύρεται καθὰ παρέδοσαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἀπαρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, οἷς καὶ φησὶν ἐπάνωθεν ἅπασι παρηκολουθηκέναι καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεσιν ἃς οὐκέτι δι' ἀκοῆς, ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ αὐτοῖς παραλαβὼν συνετάξατο· φασὶ δὲ ὡς ἄρα τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίου μνημονεύειν ὁ Παῦλος εἴωθεν, ὑπηνίκα ὡς περὶ ἰδίου τινὸς εὐαγγελίου γράφων ἔλεγε, Κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου.—H. E.* iii. 4.

[2] 'Lucas, medicus Antiochensis, ut ejus scripta indicant, Græci sermonis non ignarus fuit, sectator apostoli Pauli, et omnis peregrinationis ejus comes. Scripsit evangelium, de quo idem Paulus, Misimus, inquit, cum illo, fratrem cujus laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias. . . . . Quidam suspicantur quotiescunque in epistolis suis Paulus dicit, juxta evangelium meum. de Lucæ significare volumine; et Lucam non solo ab apostolo Paulo didicisse evangelium, qui cum domino in carne non fuerat, sed et a cæteris apostolis. Quod ipse quoque in principio sui voluminis declarat, dicens: Sicut tradiderunt nobis qui a principio ipsi viderunt et ministri fuerunt sermonis. Igitur evangelium, sicut audierat, scripsit.'—*De Viris Illustr.* c. 7.

All that Tertullian says is, 'It is the custom to ascribe Luke's digest to Paul.' The report arose from an incorrect explanation of Romans ii. 16 where Paul uses the phrase, 'my gospel,' i.e. my preaching. But the fathers, knowing that Luke had been Paul's companion, and supposing that *a written* gospel was meant, concluded that the apostle had dictated Luke's. This is virtually acknowledged by Eusebius.

Luke's preface says nothing about the Pauline origin or sanction of his gospel. He refers to eyewitnesses and others, to the primitive apostles themselves rather than Paul. All acquaintance on his part with Paul is ignored in the proem. He justifies his undertaking simply on the ground that others had preceded him in the same work, and that he had diligently investigated the traditions up to their source. The absence of all allusion to such a man as Paul, tells against the idea of the writer's dependence upon him; for we can hardly suppose that he would have omitted a fact favourable to the credibility of his own document. It cannot be shown that Paul superintended the composition of the gospel, or that he dictated any part of it; much less that he wrote it himself, as 'the anonymous Saxon' conjectures.[1] The tradition, ancient as it is, lacks a historical foundation.

But while rejecting the view of Paul's early connection with Luke as dictating or superintending his gospel, we admit that the work in question presents remarkable coincidences with Paul's epistles in language and ideas which could not have been accidental. The writer must have known and used Pauline literature.

The account of the last supper accords with that given in the 11th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians; the evangelist departing from Matthew in separating the Christian supper from the passover meal.

[1] *Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser und ihr Verhältniss zu einander* p. 251, *et seq.*

And there is a Pauline diction in the first two chapters of the gospel, which resembles the epistle to the Romans, chapters ix.–xi. Almost all the characteristic terms of these chapters may be found in the introductory history and hymns of the gospel.

The following words are common to Luke and the Pauline literature :—

*ἀγνοεῖν* ix. 45; Acts xiii. 27; xvii. 23. Used very often by Paul. *ἀγωνίζεσθαι* xiii. 24. With the exception of John xviii. 36, Paul is the only writer that uses the verb. *ἄδηλος* xi. 44. Only in 1 Cor. xiv. 8 besides. *ἀδικία*. *ἀθετεῖν* vii. 30; x. 16. Used by Paul especially, and in similar combinations, Gal. ii. 21; iii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 8. *αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεόν* used by Luke seven times altogether. Twice in the epistle to the Romans. *αἰσθάνεσθαι* ix. 45, has its correlative *αἴσθησις* in Phil. i. 9. *αἰφνίδιος* xxi. 34, only in 1 Thess. v. 3. *αἰχμαλωτίζειν* xxi. 24. Only in Paul. *ἀκαταστασία* xxi. 9. Only in Paul and James. *ἀλλά γε* xxiv. 21. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 2. *αλλ' οὐδέ* peculiar to Luke and Paul. *ἀνάγκη* xiv. 18, used in the same way in 1 Cor. vii. 37; in xxi. 23, used similarly 1 Cor. vii. 26; 2 Cor. vi. 4; xii. 10; 1 Thess. iii. 7; but not elsewhere. *ἀναζῆν* xv. 24, 32; Rom. vii. 9; xiv. 9; and Revelation. *ἀνακρίνειν* xxiii. 14 and Acts; ten times in 1 Cor. *ἀναλύειν* xii. 36; Phil. i. 23. *ἀναλῶσαι* ix. 54. Only in Gal. v. 15; and 2 Thess. ii. 8 besides. *ἀναπέμπειν* only in Luke, and Philem. 11. *ἀνθ' ὧν* i. 20; xii. 3; xix. 44; 2 Thess. ii. 10. *ἀνόητοι* in the vocative xxiv. 25. Only in Gal. iii. 1 besides. *ἄνοια* vi. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 9. *ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι* xiv. 6. Only in Rom. ix. 20 besides. *ἀνταπόδομα* xiv. 12; occurring only in Rom. xi. 9. So too *ἀνταποδοῦναι* xiv. 14. Only in Hebrews and Paul. *ἀντικείμενος* xiii. 17; xxi. 15. Only in Paul besides. *ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι* i. 54; Acts; 1 Tim. vi. 2. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* i. 48: v. 10; xii. 52; xxii. 69; 2 Cor. v. 16. *ἀπ' αἰῶνος* i. 70; Acts; Coloss. i. 26; Ephes.

iii. 9. ἀπελπίζειν only in Luke vi. 35 and Ephes. iv. 19. ἀπειθής only in Luke i. 17; Acts; and Paul. ἀποβῆναι v. 2; xxi. 13. In Phil. i. 19; and John xxi. 9. ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι of a person xvii. 30. Elsewhere only in 2 Thess. ii. 3, 6, 8. ἀποκάλυψις ii. 32. Comp. Ephes. i. 17. ἀποκείμενος xix. 20; Coloss. i. 5. ἀπολογεῖσθαι twice; Acts; only in Paul besides. ἀπολύτρωσις xxi. 28. Only in Paul and Hebrews. ἀρκεῖσθαι iii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 8. ἀροτριᾶν only in xvii. 7; and 1 Cor. ix. 10. ἀσφάλεια i. 4; Acts; 1 Thess v. 3. ἀσώτως xv. 13. Comp. ἀσωτία Ephes. v. 18; 1 Peter iv. 4. ἀτενίζειν iv. 20; xxii. 56; Acts; twice besides in Paul. ἄτοπος xxiii. 41; Acts; 2 Thess. iii. 2. ἀφιστάναι ii. 37, etc.; Acts; Paul. ἀφόβως i. 74. Comp. Phil. i. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 10; Jude 12. ἄφρον in addressing another, xi. 40; xii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 36. βιωτικός xxi. 34; 1 Cor. vi. 3, 4. βυθίζεσθαι v. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 9. Γε meaning *at least*, xi. 8. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 8. γνῶσις i. 77; xi. 52; often in Paul. δέησις i. 13; ii. 37; Acts; in almost all Paul's epistles. ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις v. 33, is Pauline. δεκτός iv. 19, 24; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Phil. iv. 18. διαγγέλλειν ix. 60; Acts; Rom. ix. 17. διαιρεῖν xv. 12. Only in 1 Cor. xii. 11. διαπορεύεσθαι three times in the gospel; Acts; Rom. xv. 24. διερμηνεύειν xxiv. 27; Acts; 1 Cor. δικαίωμα i. 6 and δικαίως xxiii. 41, both Pauline. The Pauline use of δίκαιος is in xviii. 9; xx. 20. διώκειν intransitive, xvii. 23; Phil. iii. 12. δόγμα ii. 1; Acts; in Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews. δοῦναι τόπον xiv. 9. Comp. Rom. xii. 19; Ephes. iv. 27. δυνάστης i. 52; Acts viii. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 15. ἐγκακεῖν xviii. 1, a Pauline word. εἰ καὶ xi. 8; and in Paul. εἰ μήτι *unless perhaps*, ix. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 5. εἶδος iii. 22; ix. 29; in 2 Cor. and 1 Thess. ἐκδικεῖν xviii. 3, 5; in Paul and the Revelation. ἐκδίκησις xviii. 7, 8; Acts; in Paul; Hebrews; and 1 Peter besides. ἐκδιώκειν only in xi. 49 and 1 Thess. ii. 15. ἐκφεύγειν xxi. 36; Acts. Only in Paul

and Hebrews besides. ἔνδοξος vii. 25; xiii. 17; and in Paul. ἐνδύσασθαι xxiv. 49 is a Pauline term. ἐξαποστέλλειν only in the epistle to the Galatians, in addition to the gospel and Acts. ἐξουθενεῖν xviii. 9; xxiii. 11; in Paul eight or nine times. ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους xxii. 53. Only in Coloss. i. 13 besides. ἐξουσιάζειν xxii. 25; 1 Cor. ἐπαινεῖν xvi. 8. Only in Paul besides. ἐπαναπαύεσθαι x. 6; Rom. ii. 17. ἐπιμελεῖσθαι only in Luke and 1 Tim. ἐπιφαίνειν in Luke and Titus. ἐργασία xii. 58; Acts; Ephes. iv. 19. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in an active sense in Luke and Paul, with a single exception in the latter. εὐγενής xix. 12; Acts; 1 Cor. i. 26. εὐδοκία with the sole exception of Matt. xi. 26, in Luke and Paul only. ἐφιστάναι three times in Paul, in addition to Luke. ζωγρεῖν v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 26. ἢ καί. Comp. Rom. ii. 15; iv. 9; 1 Cor. xvi. 6. ἡμέρα Κυρίου xvii. 24, a Pauline expression. ἡσυχάζειν xiv. 3; xxiii. 56; Acts; 1 Thess. iv. 11. ἠχεῖν xxi. 25; 1 Cor. xiii. 1. θυμός *wrath* iv. 28; Acts; in Paul, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. ἰδοὺ γάρ only in 2 Cor. vii. 11 besides Luke. κακοῦργος xxiii. 32, 33, 39; 2 Tim. ii. 9. κατάγειν v. 11; Acts. Only in Rom. x. 6 besides. καταισχύνειν xiii. 17, a Pauline expression, used besides only in 1 Peter ii. 6; iii. 16. καταξιοῦν xx. 35; xxi. 36; Acts; 2 Thess. i. 5. καταργεῖν xiii. 7, a favourite word of Paul's. κατευθύνειν i. 79; in the epistles to the Thessalonians. κατέχειν τὸν λόγον viii. 15. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 2. κατηρτισμένος vi. 40. Comp. Rom. ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 10; κινδυνεύειν viii. 23; Acts; 1 Cor. xv. 30. κραταιοῦσθαι i. 80; ii. 40; twice in Paul. κυριεύειν xxii. 25. Only in Paul besides. λειτουργία i. 23; Paul, and the Hebrews. μεγαλύνειν *to exalt*, i. 46, 58; Acts; in Phil., and 2 Cor. μενοῦν γε xi. 28. Only in Paul besides. μεταδιδόναι iii. 11. Only in Paul. νόμος without the article, ii. 23, 24. Elsewhere only in Paul.

Luke begins a sentence with νῦν, νῦν δέ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν,

etc.; ii. 29; v. 10, etc., similarly to the Pauline *νῦν δέ*, *νυνὶ δέ*. *ὁδὸς εἰρήνης* i. 79. Comp. Rom. iii. 17. *οἰκονομία* and *οἰκονόμος* often in Luke and Paul, but nowhere else, except 1 Peter iv. 10. *ὀπτασία* in the gospel and Acts. Only in 2 Cor. xii. 1 besides. *ὁρίζειν* xxii. 22; Acts; Rom. i. 4; Hebr. iv. 7. *ὁσιότης* i. 75; Ephes. iv. 24. *οὐχὶ ἀλλά* only in Paul besides the gospel. *ὀψώνιον* iii. 14. Frequent in Paul. *πανοπλία* xi. 22; Ephes. vi. 11, 13. *πανουργία* xx. 23. Only in Paul besides. *πάντως* iv. 23; Acts. Only in Paul besides. *πατρία* ii. 4; Acts; Ephes. iii. 15. *παρά* used comparatively, iii. 13, etc., is especially Pauline. Comp. Rom. xii. 3. *παράδεισος* xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4. *παράκλησις* ii. 25; vi. 24, Acts; in Paul only besides. *πληροῦν* applied to speech, words, or something spoken, with *τὰ ῥήματα* vii. 1; with *τὸν λόγον* Coloss. i. 25; with *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* Rom. xv. 19. *πληροφορεῖν* i. 1, a Pauline word. *πλουτεῖν εἴς τινα* xii. 21; Rom. x. 12. *πνεῦμα* connected with *δύναμις*, is found only in the gospel, Acts, and Paul. *πραγματεύεσθαι* xix. 13, has its correlative *πραγματεία* 2 Tim. ii. 4. *πράσσειν* is employed by none of the synoptists except Luke. It is in John's gospel, and very often in the Pauline writings. *πρεσβύτης* i. 18. Only in Paul besides. *προσδέχεσθαι to receive kindly*, xv. 2; Rom. xvi. 2; Phil. ii. 29. *κατὰ πρόσωπον* ii. 31; Acts; is only Pauline. *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* xx. 21; Gal. ii. 6. *πυκνά* v. 33; Acts; 1 Tim. v. 23. *σιγᾷν* only in Paul besides Luke. *σκοπεῖν* xi. 35; in Paul only besides. *σπλάγχνα ἐλέους* i. 78; Coloss. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 1. *σπουδαίως* vii. 4. Only in Paul besides. *στρατευόμενος* for *στρατιώτης* iii. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 4. *συγκαθίζειν* xxii. 55; Ephes. ii. 6. *συγκλείειν* v. 6; in Paul alone. *συγχαίρειν* only in Luke and Paul. *συμπαραγίνεσθαι* xxiii. 48; 2 Tim. iv. 16. *συμφύεσθαι* viii. 7. The correlate *σύμφυτος* is in Rom. vi. 5. *συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι* x. 40; Rom. viii. 26. *συνεσθίειν* xv. 2; Acts. Only in Paul besides.

σύνεσις ii. 47. Comp. Ephes. iii. 4; Coloss. i. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 7. συνευδοκεῖν xi. 48. Only in Paul. συνοχή xxi. 25; 2 Cor. ii. 4. σωματικός iii. 22; Coloss. ii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 8. σωτήρ applied to God, i. 47; ii. 11. So in the pastoral epistles. σωτήριος only in Luke, Ephesians, and Titus. τάξις only in Paul, Luke, and the epistle to the Hebrews. τιθέναι θεμέλιον vi. 48; xiv. 29. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10. τίς οὖν vii. 42; xx. 15, 17, is Pauline. υἱὸς with a substantive in the genitive, as υἱὸς εἰρήνης x. 6; or τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, or τοῦ φωτός, xvi. 8; xx. 34; or τῆς ἀναστάσεως xx. 36, like υἱοὶ φωτός, or ἀπειθείας, Ephes. ii. 2; v. 6. τέκνα φωτός, τέκνα ὀργῆς, Ephes. ὑποκρίνεσθαι xx. 20. Comp. συνυποκρίνεσθαι Gal. ii. 13. ὑπωπιάζειν xviii. 5. Only in 1 Cor. ix. 27 besides. ὑστέρημα xxi. 4. A Pauline word. φιλάργυρος xvi. 14; 2 Tim. iii. 2. φιλονεικία xxii. 24. The correlate φιλόνεικος 1 Cor. xi. 16. φόρος xx. 22; xxiii. 2; Rom. xiii. 6, 7. φρόνησις i. 17; Ephes. i. 8. φυλακή in the plural, only in Luke and 2 Cor. χαίρειν ἐν x. 20. Only in Paul. χαρίζεσθαι only in Luke and Paul. χάριν ἔχειν xvii. 9; in 1 and 2 Tim; and the epistle to the Hebrews. χαριτοῦν i. 28; Ephes. i. 6. The noun χάρις is more frequently used by Luke than the other evangelists, being a distinctive Pauline term. ψαλμός only in Luke and Paul.

Besides these linguistic similarities, there are various parallels consisting of ideas and words together, which unite Luke with the Pauline literature.

| LUKE. | PAULINE. |
|---|---|
| The *gracious words* which proceeded out of his mouth (iv. 22). | Let your *speech* be always *with grace* (Coloss. iv. 6). Let no corrupt *word* proceed out of your mouth but . . . that it may minister *grace* unto the hearers (Ephes. iv. 29). |
| His word was with power (iv. 32). | My speech was in demonstration of the Spirit and of power (1 Cor. ii. 4). |
| Your Father also is merciful (vi. 36). | The Father of mercies (2 Cor. i. 3). By the mercies of God (Rom. xii. 1). |

| LUKE. | PAULINE. |
| --- | --- |
| Can the blind lead the blind? (vi. 39). | And art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind (Rom. ii. 19). |
| Laid the foundation (vi. 48). | I have laid the foundation (1 Cor. iii. 10). |
| Bring forth fruit with patience (viii. 15). | Being fruitful . . . . unto all patience (Coloss. i. 10, 11). |
| Is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save (ix. 56). | Hath given for edification, and not destruction (2 Cor. x. 8). |
| Eat such things as are set before you (x. 8). | Whatsoever is set before you, eat (1 Cor. x. 27). |
| Your names are written in heaven (x. 20). | Whose names are in the book of life (Phil. iv. 3). |
| Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes (x. 21). | I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent (1 Cor. i. 19). God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise (27th verse). |
| xi. 36.—Same idea as in | Ephes. v. 13. |
| All things are clean unto you (xi. 41). | Unto the pure all things are pure (Titus i. 15). |
| I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute (xi. 49). | Who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us (1 Thess. ii. 15) |
| Let your loins be girded about (xii. 35). | Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth (Ephes. vi. 14). |
| Who then is a faithful steward (xii. 42). | Moreover, it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful (1 Cor. iv. 2). |
| That men ought always to pray, and not to faint (xviii. 1). | Wherefore also we pray always (2 Thess. i. 11). Always labouring fervently for you in prayers (Coloss. iv. 12). |
| God forbid (xx. 16). | Rom. ix. 14; xi. 11. Gal. iii. 21. |
| This that is written, the stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken (xx. 17, 18). | As it is written, Behold I lay a stumbling-stone and rock of offence (Rom. ix. 33). |
| For all live unto him (xx. 38). | For whether we live, we live unto the Lord (Rom. xiv. 8). |
| In patience possess ye your souls (xxi. 19). | To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, eternal life (Rom. ii. 7). |
| Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled (xxi. 24). | Blindness is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in (Rom. xi. 25). |

| LUKE. | PAULINE. |
| --- | --- |
| Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and that day come upon you unawares (xxi. 34). | Sudden destruction cometh upon them . . . therefore let us be sober (1 Thess. v. 3–8). See Rom. xiii. 11–14. |
| Watch therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things . . . and to stand before the Son of man (xxi. 36). | Praying always with all prayer and supplication, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication (Ephes. vi. 18). Appear before the judgment-seat of Christ (2 Cor. v. 10). |

The full force of this comparison can be felt by those only who examine the original, observing the general style and structure of sentences, as well as the terms and ideas peculiar to both. The mind of the evangelist was impregnated with the views and phraseology of Paul, so that the Pauline letters furnish numerous affinities.

## AUTHORSHIP.

The earliest apostolic fathers have no quotation from the gospel, nor any express allusion to it. In Clement's epistle to the Corinthians (chapter xiii.), a place resembling Luke vi. 36–38 in some respects, differs from it and all the gospel parallels so much, that it seems to have been taken from tradition. Hermas contains no clear allusion to Luke's gospel; and Papias does not seem to have been acquainted with it, since Eusebius never mentions the fact, which he would probably have done. Credner's attempt to show that Papias's language refers to Luke's preface is unsuccessful. The Ignatian epistles show no trace of acquaintance with our gospel. The epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians has one passage,[1] 'Remembering what the Lord has taught us, saying, "judge not, and ye shall not be judged; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. Be ye merciful, and ye shall obtain mercy: for with the same measure that ye

[1] In chapter ii.

mete withal it shall be measured to you again,"' in which both Matthew and Luke's gospels may have been used, the former more closely than the latter.

Justin Martyr was familiar with the gospel of Luke, though he does not assign it to him. The following are the principal passages in which he has respect to the third gospel: 'But the power of God coming upon the virgin overshadowed her, and caused her to conceive, though still a virgin. Moreover the angel of God who was sent to the virgin, at that very time saluted her, saying, Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Ghost, and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins.'[1] 'Mary the virgin, when the angel Gabriel announced to her that the Spirit of the Lord would come upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadow her, wherefore also that holy one born of her is the Son of God, answered: Be it unto me according to thy word.'[2] (Compare Luke i. 26–38.)

'The first taxing in Judea being then made in the time of Quirinius, Joseph had gone up from Nazareth where he dwelt, to Bethlehem, whence he was, to be taxed. For his descent was from the tribe of Judah inhabiting that country.'[3]

'The law and the prophets were till John the Bap-

[1] *δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσα τῇ παρθένῳ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτὴν καὶ κυοφορῆσαι παρθένον οὖσαν πεποίηκε· καὶ ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν παρθένον κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ἄγγελος Θεοῦ εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτήν, εἰπών· Ἰδοὺ συλλήψει ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς Ὑψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*—*Apol.* i. 33.

[2] *Μαρία ἡ παρθένος, εὐαγγελιζομένου αὐτῇ Γαβριὴλ ἀγγέλου, ὅτι πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπελεύσεται, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει αὐτήν, διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς ἅγιόν ἐστιν Υἱὸς Θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίνατο· Γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου.*—*Dial.* 100.

[3] *ἀπογραφῆς οὔσης ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, ἀνηλθεν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ ἔνθα ᾤκει, εἰς Βηθλεὲμ ὅθεν ἦν, ἀπογράψασθαι· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς κατοικούσης τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην φυλῆς Ἰούδα τὸ γένος ἦν.*—*Dial.* 78. See also *Apol.* i. 34; Luke ii. 2, etc.

tist; henceforward the kingdom of heaven suffers violence and the violent take it by force. And if ye will receive him, this is Elias who was to come. He that hath ears to hear let him hear.'[1] (Luke xvi. 16, and Matt. xi. 13.) The first part is from Luke, the rest from Matthew. It is not uncommon in Justin to join the words of several evangelists.

'When a certain man came to him and said, "Good master," he answered and said, "There is none good save one, that is God, who created all things."[2] "Why callest thou me good? One is good, my Father who is in heaven"'[3] (Luke xviii. 19).

'The things which are impossible with men, are possible with God'[4] (Luke xviii. 27).

'Our Lord said, that they shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but be equal to angels, being children of God *and* of the resurrection'[5] (Luke xx. 34, etc.).

'The apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have related that Jesus thus commanded them; that having taken bread and given thanks he said, Do this in remembrance of me; this is my body: and that in like manner having taken the cup and given thanks, he said, This is my blood, and that he distributed to these alone'[6] (Luke xxii. 19, etc.).

[1] *ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ· ἐξ ὅτου βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν· καὶ εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.—Dial.* 51.

[2] *καὶ προσελθόντος αὐτῷ τινος καὶ εἰπόντος, Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων, Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα.—Apol.* i. 16.

[3] *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. —Dial.* 101.

[4] *τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρα Θεῷ.—Apol.* i. 19.

[5] *ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν εἶπεν, Ὅτι οὔτε γαμήσουσιν οὔτε γαμηθήσονται ἀλλὰ ἰσάγγελοι ἔσονται, τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ὄντες.—Dial.* 81.

[6] *οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀναμνησίν μου, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι.—Apol.* i. 66. Compare also *Dial.* ch. 41 and 70.

The accounts which Justin gives of the prediction of Christ's sufferings and resurrection coincide very closely with Luke's in their phraseology, and in all the particulars where the other synoptists vary. They also contain what is peculiar to Luke, viz. that the sufferings were a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. Hence we infer that he used the third gospel.[1]

'In the memoirs, which I say were composed by the apostles and those who followed them (it is written), that sweat like drops flowed down (Jesus) while praying and saying, Let this cup, if it be possible, pass from me'[2] (Luke xxii. 44). While the last part of this passage refers to Matt. xxvi. 39, the former is certainly from Luke.

The context states that Pilate sent Jesus bound, to Herod, a fact given in Luke alone, xxiii. 6, etc. 'Jesus as he gave up his spirit on the cross said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'[3] (Luke xxiii. 46).

It is possible that some of these passages may have been taken from an apocryphal gospel, for it is highly probable that Justin used a document of that kind in addition to the synoptics, especially for his statements relative to the birth and infancy of Jesus; but most of them show the direct use of Luke. His manner was to intermix quotations from several sources, and not to give the texts verbally.

There is no doubt that Marcion had the gospel of Luke, which he adapted to his own ideas by arbitrary treatment. He lived before Justin, about A.D. 140; and is the earliest writer from whom we learn the existence of the gospel.

[1] See *Dial.* 70. 100. 51.

[2] *ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντέταχθαι, ὅτι ἱδρὼς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο, αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου καὶ λέγοντος, Παρελθέτω εἰ δυνατὸν τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο.—Dial.* 103.

[3] *καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ εἶπε, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.—Dial.* 105.

The Ebionite author of the Clementine Homilies (about A.D. 170) knew and used the gospel, as several passages show, especially one in Hom. xix. 2, compared with xi. 35, which shows that Luke x. 18 was the source. Another in ix. 22 is taken from Luke x. 20. Probably also a passage in Hom. iii. 15 was influenced by Luke x. 24, as well as by Matthew ; and another in iii. 30 by Luke ix. 5. In Hom. xvii. 5 there is a passage from Luke xviii. 6–8 ; while Hom. ii. 13 shows an acquaintance with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Credner [1] enumerates twenty-four places in which Luke was used by the Clementine author, but several are doubtful.[2] The first book of the Clementine Recognitions also shows acquaintance with Luke.

Whether Basilides and Valentinus used it is uncertain ; for Hippolytus's 'Philosophumena' refer to these heretics in a vague and general way. Their disciples unquestionably employed all the canonical gospels ; and Hippolytus seems to have quoted from them opinions which he ascribes to their leaders. Many expressions of the New Testament which Irenæus gives from the Valentinians in his first book are taken from the third gospel. According to Agrippa Castor, Basilides composed twenty-four books on *the gospel*,[3] but that expression should not be identified with the four canonical gospels. It means Christian truth as Basilides supposed it to have been handed down from the apostles ; and does not necessarily denote one or more *written* gospels. The passage in the 'Philosophumena,' which is thought to prove Basilides's use of the third gospel, is in vii. 26, quoting Luke i. 35, but introduced by the usual *he says*,[4] which has no definite subject, and may mean either Basilides or one of his school ; the latter most probably, as a wide induction of examples shows.

[1] *Beiträge*, i. pp. 284–330.
[2] See Zeller's *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 53, *et seq.*
[3] εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. [4] φησί.

The same passage in Luke is said to be cited by Valentinus (vi. 35), with the word *he says* in the introductory context, which points to one of the Valentinians, not to the head of the sect.

Celsus seems to have known it, as he refers to the genealogy of Christ going up to Adam.[1] The place in which there is an allusion to two angels appearing at the grave of Jesus, may point either to Luke or John.[2] Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 180) has the words of Luke xviii. 27 in his second book to Autolycus.

The Muratorian fragment is the earliest work which expressly assigns the gospel to Luke (A.D. 170); and Irenæus comes immediately after (A.D. 177–202). Clement of Alexandria adopts the same opinion, and the fathers generally follow it. Tertullian, however, expresses himself vaguely on the point, in a way unlike his usually confident one.[3]

The testimonies we have adduced lead up to the year 130, and show that the gospel existed in the circles where Marcion and Justin lived. But they do not tell us how widely it was known, what repute it had, or who its author was. It does not appear to have been much known out of Rome in their time; nor was it preferred by them to an extra-canonical gospel or gospels which they employed along with it. Neither itself, nor those of Matthew and Mark in addition, were the exclusive source whence the earliest ecclesiastical writers drew their knowledge of gospel history.

The work itself does not state that Luke wrote it, nor do the Acts of the Apostles. The desire to have a Pauline gospel fixed itself upon the third and attributed it to Luke—an inference drawn from the Acts, where it is said that the author of the account of Paul's journey was his companion, and accompanied him to Rome. That author was identified with Luke not

[1] Origen *contra Celsum* ii. 32. [2] *Ibid.* v. 52.
[3] 'Evangelium quod Lucæ refertur.'—*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 4.

only because of the notices in Coloss. iv. 14, 2, Timothy iv. 11, but also the tradition that he was with the apostle in Rome. This identification, making the *we-document* in the Acts proceed from Luke, led at once to his authorship of the whole work. And when he was chosen as the writer of the Acts, the conclusion that he wrote the gospel necessarily followed. We shall show hereafter, that Luke was not the author of the Acts, though the latter incorporated in his larger document parts of an itinerary made by Luke. The gospel and Acts proceeded from the same hand; but it was not Luke's.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The gospel may be divided into five parts.

1. Narrative of the birth and childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus, i. 4–ii. 52.

2. Circumstances preparatory to Christ's public ministry, iii. 1–iv. 13.

3. His appearances in Galilee as the Messiah, iv. 14–ix. 50.

4. Discourses and events in his last journey to Jerusalem, with his triumphal entry into the city, ix. 51–xxi. 38.

5. His apprehension, crucifixion, death, resurrection, and ascension, xxii. 1–xxiv. 53.

After the preface, the evangelist gives the announcement of the births of John and of Jesus (i. 5–38), with Mary's visit to Elizabeth, followed by John's birth and circumcision (i. 39–80). The supernatural generation, the angelic annunciation to Mary, with the prophecies uttered by her and Elizabeth, the revelations from heaven made to the shepherds at night, the birth at Bethlehem instead of Nazareth, complete this introductory history, which, like the visit of the Magi guided by a miraculous star, is of mythic aspect and

later growth, all tending to invest Jesus with Messianic dignity from his origin. The journey of Mary to Elizabeth and the circumstances connected with it, partake of the marvellous. Nor can this history of the birth and infancy be brought into harmony with Matthew's gospel in several particulars. Thus—

Luke supposes that before the birth of Jesus, which took place only accidentally at Bethlehem, Joseph and Mary lived at Nazareth. On the contrary, Matthew supposes that Bethlehem was their place of abode; for Joseph, but for the intervention of certain circumstances, would have returned to Judea after his flight into Egypt, to Bethlehem, not to Nazareth in Galilee. The birth at Bethlehem rests upon a precarious foundation, because it originated in the view that the Messiah must spring from the city of David—a view agreeing with Matthew's adaptation of Micah's prophecy.

Nor is there room for the murder of the children in Bethlehem and the flight to Egypt in Luke's narrative. 'The Magi must have been at Bethlehem,' says the translator of Schleiermacher, 'before Jesus's presentation; for not only does Luke make the parents return immediately after that ceremony to Nazareth, but, according to his statement of the whole transaction, there is not the slightest conceivable motive for a fresh prolonged stay in the strange town of Bethlehem. No ground for the supposition either of employment in Bethlehem, or of an intention to settle there, is afforded by Luke's narrative, or even consistent with it; and all its vividness is destroyed, if we imagine that Joseph's return to Bethlehem was merely omitted. . . . . The point must be allowed to be clear, when we take into the account that Joseph went to Bethlehem solely on account of the registry, how ill Mary was accommodated there in her labour, and how reluctant they must have been to undergo the fatigue of a double journey. Now had the Magi arrived before the presentation, in

that case, considering how near Bethlehem was to Jerusalem, intelligence would certainly have reached the former place of Herod's inquiries after the birthplace of the Messiah, and that the Magi discovered it by the direction thence obtained. Moreover the Magi must have had the dream, which warned them against returning to Jerusalem, at Bethlehem, and it is much more probable that they related, than that they suppressed it. Must not Joseph now, considering Herod's notorious character, have conceived suspicion from these circumstances, and abandoned the wholly needless journey to Jerusalem? The flight into Egypt, therefore, is indeed very naturally connected with the visit of the Magi and the attention it excited. . . . but the journey to Jerusalem is inconsistent with it.'[1]

The next incident is the interesting one of Jesus teaching in the temple (ii. 41–52), when he was twelve years of age.

The 3rd chapter begins with the preaching and baptism of John, and proceeds to the baptism of Jesus, giving a genealogical register of the descent of Joseph.

It is impossible for us at the present day to account for Luke's passing by the genealogy in Matthew and giving another so different. According to his preface he searched diligently and took an independent course. He may have followed a written pedigree or pedigrees which the Jewish Christians had compiled; but without adopting it implicitly. Probably tradition and his own research had a share in his genealogy of Joseph as well as an existing register. Wittichen and Scholten think that it was a later addition to the gospel—an opinion for which there is no good basis. One thing is certain, that the Davidic descent of Jesus was commonly believed at the time, in conformity with the national Jewish idea that the Messiah was to be a descendant of David. When Luke wrote, an opinion was entertained

[1] *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, translated, pp. 46, 47.

that Joseph was only the *putative* father of Jesus, and therefore he throws in the clause *as was supposed*, in iii. 23. A higher origin is also ascribed to him in Matthew. Yet both evangelists trace his birth to David through Joseph, as if he were Joseph's son by natural descent. The later view is appended to the early belief embodied in the original genealogies, with which indeed it does not agree. The tables are dominated by an apologetic interest in showing Jesus's Davidic descent; for the early Christians were desirous to assert his Messianic dignity in opposition to the Jews who denied it, and derived it from his Davidic origin; *Messiah* and *the son of David* being in their opinion equivalent. As the registers proceeded from a doctrinal rather than a historical motive, their artificial combinations and assumptions puzzle the harmonists, who labour in vain to bring the two into agreement. All that they clearly convey is, that Jesus was the son of Joseph—a testimony prior in time to the belief of his supernatural birth.

Two able critics who have attempted to reconcile these genealogies, Wieseler and Lord Arthur Hervey, illustrate these remarks. Their arbitrary suppositions, often opposite to the plain records, are evidence of entanglement. Thus the latter concludes from the fact that a second genealogy is given (that of Luke), that the first gives Joseph's genealogy as legal successor to the throne of David; the second, Joseph's private genealogy. Hence Matthew's is not Joseph's real paternal stem. If it were, there would be no room for another! The absurdity of this is patent. The bishop asserts, without the least evidence, that Mary was first-cousin to her husband Joseph, 'so that, in point of *fact* though not in *form*, both genealogies are as much hers as her husband's.'[1]

The genealogy of Joseph, as given by Luke, is

[1] See Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 666.

different from, and in various points irreconcilable with, Matthew's.

1. Luke says that Joseph was the son of Heli; Matthew, that he was the son of Jacob. The former makes Salathiel the son of Neri; the latter, of Jechonias. The two genealogies agree in the two names Salathiel and Zorobabel alone, between David and Joseph the husband of Mary; the descent being traced through a different set of names. In Matthew, the line comes through Solomon and the known series of kings; in Luke, through Nathan and a succession of unknown persons. Though the genealogies therefore agree from Abraham to David, they differ from the latter onward. How is the difficulty about Joseph's parentage removed? Many assume a levirate marriage, according to which Matthew gives the *natural*, Luke the *legal* descent. This assumes that Heli and Jacob were only half-brothers, sons of the same mother but of different fathers. The same arrangement is called into requisition for the appearance of Salathiel and Zorobabel. There was a levirate marriage in the case of Salathiel's mother, so that Neri and Jechonias were half-brothers. Such complicated machinery betrays a hopeless cause. Neither Matthew nor Luke hints that Joseph's father was other than his real one. Besides, it was contrary to Jewish custom to introduce the natural father into a legal genealogy. The legal father alone was adduced.

Another method of bringing agreement into the genealogies is, to assume that Luke gives the descent of Mary, while Matthew gives Joseph's. To unite this with the text, it is proposed by some to supply the Greek article[1] accompanying Heli with *the son in law* of Heli, which is against the context. With this hypothesis is united another, that Mary was an heiress whose husband must have been in her register. But it is very improbable that Mary was heir to property; and if she

[1] τοῦ Ἡλί.

were, that the law recognising her claim to it was still in force. It should also be noticed, that the Davidic descent of Mary is unprovable. In Luke i. 27, it is stated that Joseph (not Mary) was of the house of David; which is repeated in ii. 4. Both evangelists give the descent of Joseph. The existence of the two registers shows the industrious efforts of the Jewish Christians in tracing the Davidic descent of Jesus, which it was difficult to do in face of the fact that he himself did not assume to be David's son, but simply the 'Son of man.' The irreconcilable differences of the genealogies attest the embarrassment of their compilers, who were naturally anxious to find a royal lineage for the lowly Nazarene who claimed to be the Messiah; since the Messiah was to be of the house of David, according to the Old Testament. But Jesus was another Messiah than that of Jewish expectation, a different ideal of a great deliverer.

The narrative of Jesus's temptation in the wilderness follows (iv. 1–13). After this He begins to preach in Galilee, at Nazareth in particular (14–30). The visit to Nazareth seems to be the same as that in Matt. xiii. 54, etc., and therefore Luke puts it too early. The twenty-third verse clearly implies that Jesus had already done great works in Capernaum; so that Luke contradicts his previous statement. The object for which the evangelist introduced it at this place is to account for Jesus going to Capernaum (verse 31). At the latter place He healed a demoniac, Peter's mother-in-law, and other sick persons (31–44).

The 5th chapter relates how Peter was called away from his occupation of fishing to be a disciple; after which Jesus cures a leper and one sick of the palsy (verses 1–26). This is succeeded by Levi's call and what happened in his house (27–39).

Passing over the cure of Jairus's daughter, of the woman with an issue of blood, two blind men and a

dumb one, the sending out of the twelve, and the message of John from prison, which the first gospel has here, Luke relates the incident of the disciples plucking ears of corn on the sabbath, and the cure of the man who had a withered hand (vi. 1–11). At this point the selection of the twelve apostles is described, which is followed by an abridged and altered account of the sermon delivered on *the mount*, according to Matthew ; but in the present gospel on *a plain* (vi. 17). The report is fragmentary and loosely connected, though Holtzmann asserts the contrary. It is less original than Matthew's; since it gives Jesus's words a moral bearing against the conduct of sinners generally, not against Jewish legality. The identity of the discourses reported by the two evangelists is generally acknowledged at the present day ; though it bears unfavourably on a certain view of inspiration.[1]

The 7th chapter contains the incident relating to the centurion at Capernaum, whose servant, though absent, was healed; the raising of the widow of Nain's son, the message of the Baptist to Jesus, and the anointing by a penitent woman. The woman is usually thought to be Mary Magdalene ; Luke himself, who introduces her immediately after (viii. 2), does not seem to have believed so. It is difficult to decide on the identity of the history respecting the woman who anointed Jesus in Luke's gospel with that in Matthew, xxvi. 6, etc.; Mark xiv. 3, etc.; John xii. 1, etc. If the two accounts be identical, Luke has modified and altered the circumstances of the case, connecting the woman's love as a manifestation of her faith, with the forgiveness of her sins. The main fact of the host being Simon, speaks for the sameness, and it is unlikely that the disciples would have blamed the woman for wasting her ointment (Matt. xxvi. 8) if Jesus had already accepted unction from another woman.

[1] See Tholuck's *Ausführliche Auslegung der Bergpredigt Christi*, Einleitung, § 2, p. 17, etc., dritte Ausgabe.

The commencement of the 8th chapter consists of a summary notice of Jesus's ministry in Galilee resembling that in iv. 14, 15. This is followed by mention of the women who waited upon Him and supplied his wants (viii. 1–3). Jesus now propounds the parable of the sower (4–18). When his mother and brethren visit Him, He gives an enlarged and loving extension to *mother* and *brethren* (19–21). His stilling a storm on the lake is introduced without any chronological note, just as the visit of His relations is. In Matthew's gospel both occupy different positions from those in Luke. Other miracles follow: the expulsion of devils from the Gadarene demoniac, the raising of Jairus's daughter, and the cure of the woman with a bloody flux (22–56).

The 9th chapter narrates the sending forth of the twelve disciples, Herod's desire to see Jesus, the miraculous feeding of five thousand people, the confession of Peter, the transfiguration, the healing of a lunatic, the prediction of Christ's own death, and the dispute of the disciples about precedence (1–50). According to Luke and Mark, the disciples did not strive with one another about rank in the kingdom of Messiah, as in Matthew, but about their individual position in the esteem of Jesus. The two verses 49 and 50, in which John asks of the Master whether he ought to have forbidden a person from following Jesus who had attempted to exorcise demons in his name, and the reply, are peculiar to Mark and Luke. The connection between the passage and what precedes it is obscure; nor is Meyer's explanation satisfactory. The introduction of it has the appearance of arbitrariness (ix. 1–50).

The evangelist, having rapidly passed over the Galilean ministry of Jesus, giving only such parts of it as were most easily adapted to a Pauline tendency, introduces a section which is more or less peculiar to himself.

In it he follows documents and forsakes Matthew's narrative. The insertion in question (ix. 51–xviii. 14) has given great trouble to harmonists.

The narrative of Jesus's journey to Jerusalem commences with His inhospitable treatment by the Samaritans, and His demands upon such as wished to become followers (51–62). He then sends out seventy disciples to work miracles and to preach, who return and tell of their success (x. 1–24). To these non-apostolic disciples Luke transfers the most honourable injunctions given to the twelve apostles in Matthew's gospel. Their mission on extra-Judaic ground comports with the Pauline element pervading the gospel; and the question of a lawyer about obtaining eternal life, leads to the parable of the Good Samaritan (25–37). Whether this interview with the lawyer is the same as the later one of Matthew xxii. 35, etc., Mark xii. 28, etc., cannot be easily settled. The identity of Matthew and Mark's accounts is probable, but Luke's differs materially. Yet it is possible that all three are variations of one and the same tradition. The original incident may have been shaped in different forms by the evangelical tradition, as Strauss supposes. The entertainment in the house of Martha and Mary is introduced indefinitely, without specification of place or time (x. 38–42).

At the request of his disciples, Jesus teaches them to pray, and that with earnest importunity (xi. 1–13). Matthew introduces the Lord's prayer into the sermon on the mount. Here it comes too late. As he was casting out a dumb spirit, he rebuked the Pharisees for their blasphemous imputation of his power to Beelzebub, blessed a certain woman who addressed him, preached to the people about unbelief, and reprehended the Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers (14–54). The fact that His severe denunciations of the Pharisees in 37–54, were uttered at the table of a Pharisee, is unlikely.

Place and time are both unsuitable, and disagree with Matthew's representation.

The 12th chapter contains a discourse or discourses addressed to the disciples, but with apostrophes to the people generally. It is a compilation, the matter essentially original, the form proceeding from the evangelist himself, with the help of the first gospel.

The 13th chapter begins with the story of the Galileans murdered by Pilate in the temple, and the account of another occurrence in Siloam, upon which Jesus founds an exhortation to repentance. The parable of the barren fig-tree inculcates the same lesson (xiii. 1–9). This is followed by the cure of a diseased woman on the sabbath (10–17), various parables descriptive of the kingdom of God (18–21), with exhortations to enter into it, and Herod's alleged lying in wait for Jesus. The last (31–35) is peculiar to Luke, and would lead to the supposition that Jesus was in Galilee or Perœa; whereas it follows from ix. 51, etc., that he was now in Judea. The lamentation over Jerusalem (34, 35) is not in its proper place here, as it is in Matthew xxiii. 37, etc. It belongs to the time succeeding Christ's entry into the metropolis.

In the 14th chapter, Jesus cures a dropsical man on the sabbath, teaches humility by a parable, and recommends charity toward the poor (1–14). This is followed by the parable of the great supper (15–24), the claims of Jesus on His followers (25–35), showing that they must calculate well beforehand, lest they apostatise and become unprofitable like salt that has lost its savour (15–35).

The 15th chapter has three parables illustrating the mercy of God toward penitent sinners. The first is that of the lost sheep; the second, of the piece of silver; the third of the prodigal son. These teach the extension of divine mercy to the Gentiles, in opposition to the narrow prejudices of the Jews.

The following chapter contains the parable of the unjust steward, in which a culpable trait is used as the instrument of instruction. Verses 10–13 follow the parable, not unnaturally. The hypocrisy of the covetous Pharisees is reproved (14, 15), and these words are added: 'The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of heaven is preached, and every man presseth into it. And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail. Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery'—which it is difficult, if not impossible, to connect with the preceding context. All attempts to link them on to the foregoing verses have been failures. One can only have recourse to Marcion's reading, 'one tittle of *my words* to fail' (instead of *the law*); and then the adduced inviolability of the marriage tie exemplifies the assertion. The chapter concludes with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, directed against the worldly who live in security and fail to make a proper use of their possessions, as is recommended at the close of the unjust steward's case. The first part of it has the Jewish Essene view of riches, liberality, and poverty (compare vi. 20, 24; xvi. 9), which appears in the gospel elsewhere; the last portion (27–31) is the evangelist's addition or rather insertion, for the parable was taken from a written source. Olshausen's attempt to show the antipharisaic tendency of the latter parable is unsuccessful.

The 17th chapter contains other discourses of Jesus, respecting occasions of offence, the power of faith and the unprofitableness of works (1–10). The cure of ten lepers is introduced in an unsuitable manner: 'And it came to pass as he went to Jerusalem *that he passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.*' The object of the words in italics is plain, to account for a Samaritan being found among the lepers. But the meaning

is ambiguous; and the formula of introduction does not agree well with ix. 51. The cure of the lepers is followed by discourses about the future appearing of the Son of man, and the nature of the kingdom of God (20–37). Two parables, that of the importunate widow (xviii. 1–8), and that of the Pharisee and publican (9–14), convey instructions of different kinds. The former is connected with the coming of Jesus, an event which was so important to His disciples as to stir them up to unceasing prayer, because of the recompence it would bring them. He should then avenge his elect speedily. The second parable belonged originally to a different context, for it has no natural connection with the preceding.

At this point the extra-canonical sources used by Luke terminated; at least, he leaves them here, falling back into the synoptic course of events.

Children were brought to Christ that He might touch them (xviii. 15–17). This is followed by the narrative of the rich young man (18–27), having its parallels in Matthew and Mark. In answer to Peter's assertion that he and his fellow-apostles had forsaken all to follow Jesus, the Master assures him that they should be abundantly rewarded (28–30). He then foretells His own death (31–34), and restores sight to a blind man at Jericho (35–43).

The 19th chapter narrates the conversion of Zaccheus the publican (1–10), the parable of the pounds which were entrusted to different persons, and the way in which they used them (11–28). This is followed by Jesus's triumphal entry into Jerusalem with His lamentation over the city (29–44). He commences by purifying the temple, driving out the buyers and sellers; and though the chief priests and scribes wished to destroy Him, they were unable as yet to accomplish their purpose (45–48).

Christ replies to a question of the chief priests and

scribes respecting the source of His authority by asking the source of John's baptism (xx. 1–8); after which He declares the parable of the vineyard (9–18). He silences the spies of the Pharisees, who put Him an ensnaring question about tribute (19–26), and the Sadducees about the resurrection (27–40). He calls their attention to the point how Christ can be the son of David (41–44), and warns the disciples against the scribes (45–47).

The 21st chapter contains Christ's commendation of the poor widow for her contribution to the treasury, followed by a discourse about the destruction of Jerusalem and His future coming. The last shows a later modification of the tradition than Matthew's. Here the persecutions of Christ's followers are represented as occurring *before* the wars and commotions mentioned, whereas in the first gospel they follow such disturbances (verse 12).

The 22nd chapter describes the conspiracy of the chief priests and scribes against Jesus, and the treachery of Judas Iscariot (1–6). This is followed by the preparations for eating the passover, and the meal itself, which He and his apostles partook of (7–38). At this supper Jesus speaks to them about ambition, because they disputed which should be accounted the greatest; and assures Peter that his faith should not fail though he might deny his Master thrice. The passage about the disputation of the disciples has no proper connection with its context. A similar fact had been already related by the evangelist (ix. 46); and we can scarcely resist the impression that if this be historical, its proper place is earlier. But it may have arisen from Matt. xx. 20, etc. The words addressed to Peter (31–35) are represented as spoken at the last supper, as in the fourth gospel; in Matthew and Mark they are spoken on the way to Gethsemane.

The exhortation to the disciples about their providing

for combat and danger, is peculiar to this evangelist (35–38). Its connection with the context and its originality can hardly be maintained, least of all by the method which Meyer proposes. The object of it is to account for the fact that Peter is subsequently in possession of a sword at the time of Jesus's apprehension. The rest of the chapter contains the agony in Gethsemane, His capture, Peter's denial, Jesus's shameful treatment, and His appearance before the Sanhedrim (39–66). The deviations from Matthew and Mark in the narration of these incidents are mostly for the worse.

The account given by Luke of the last supper which Jesus partook of with his disciples, differs from that of Matthew and Mark in some important particulars. Jesus took a cup, as is said, and gave it to the apostles to distribute among themselves (xxii. 17). Of this first cup he did not partake himself, as is implied in the following verse: 'I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.' After breaking the bread and giving it to His followers to eat, Jesus took the second cup, which belonged to the last supper properly so-called not to the passover meal, and gave it to those present. Thus Christ did not observe the passover meal at all, according to the law. The drinking of wine by the master of the house was an essential part of the entertainment. Matthew's narrative plainly says that Christ *did* partake of the paschal meal; and therefore Luke's account is not original. That it is designedly so, accords with the general tenor and Pauline character of the gospel. In the eyes of the evangelist, Jesus's sufferings and death were of vital importance. Hence he prefixes an announcement of them to the narrative of the supper. And the words of the sixteenth verse, in which Jesus expresses a refusal to eat the passover till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God, indicate the close of His earthly course. The

first cup which He gives to the disciples is merely symbolical; and *this passover* (verse 15) is used in the Christian sense of a passover,[1] not in the legal, Jewish one. The whole transaction has received a symbolical and Christian aspect, excluding the proper Jewish rite, and showing the superiority of Christ to the law of Moses.[2]

It has been already remarked, that the institution of the supper as given by Luke has a close agreement with Paul's account in the first epistle to the Corinthians, xi. 23–26. The practical influence of the apostle of the Gentiles gradually shaped and fixed a liturgical formula followed by the evangelist in preference to the words of the institution in Matthew. The allusion to the future in Luke and Paul, 'this do in remembrance of me,' is not in the other gospels and can scarcely be considered original.

The 23rd chapter relates how Jesus was led before Pilate, who wished to set Him free and sent Him to Herod. The latter, with his men of war, set him at nought and mocked him; after which He was remitted to Pilate (1–12). When Pilate had made several attempts to let Him go, he yielded to the persistent rage of the chief priests and rulers, and delivered Him up to execution. The blame is laid upon the Jews; and Pilate the heathen ruler is all but exculpated, in accordance with the Paulinism of the writer. Accordingly He was led away to the place of crucifixion, where two malefactors were waiting execution at the same time and in the same manner. The circumstances of his death are minutely related; the account of the conduct of the malefactors supplementing and rectifying that given by Matthew. At the time of His death a preternatural darkness overshadowed the whole earth; the centurion present glorified God; the spectators became serious

[1] πάσχα.

[2] See De Wette's *Exeget. Handbuch on Luke*, pp. 145, 146, 3rd edit.

(13–49). Joseph of Arimathea took down the body from the cross, and laid it in his new sepulchre (50–56).

The last chapter narrates the resurrection of Jesus. The women that came to the sepulchre received the first intimation that he had risen from two angels, in consequence of which they returned and told the eleven as well as the rest, who were incredulous. Peter then ran to the grave, and seeing it empty, was amazed (1–12). He appeared for the first time to Peter, in accordance with 1 Cor. xv. 5 ; and afterwards to two disciples on their way to Emmaus (13–35). The latter narrative is peculiar to Luke and belongs to a different source from the preceding context. Perhaps it was meant as a set-off against the appearance to Peter alone ; as though the risen one had shown himself to those outside the apostolic circle. Mark gives a brief extract from the account. He then appeared to all the disciples in Jerusalem (36–43). An address to them is loosely appended to the preceding context, which may or may not have been made on the same occasion (44–49). Having led them out to Bethany, he blessed and was parted from them.

The chapter contains much that is marvellous and inexplicable ; the angelic appearances to the women at the sepulcure, whose minds where in a peculiarly excited state ; the mode in which the body left the sepulchre ; the nature of that resurrection-body, Jesus's sudden disappearance in it, though he showed his hands and feet as if it consisted of flesh and bones still. The ascension took place on the day he rose, without an interval of forty days as is related in the Acts of the Apostles. But Luke does not always mark distinctions of time, so that the forty days may be inserted at the fiftieth verse. Ordinary principles of interpretation applied to the chapter, fail to bring out any definite knowledge of its contents ; and the higher criticism itself must be

contented with an idealising process. Conservative critics will attach importance to the letter of the evangelic record, to the empty sepulchre, the difficulty of supposing mere visions in the mind of the disciples the second day after Jesus died, to the numerous witnesses for the bodily resurrection, and the probability of miracle here if at all. They will hesitate to forsake the old faith of the Church—a step involving the serious assumption that the apostles were deceived. Others more speculative but not less honest, will resolve the fact into a spiritual resurrection having the souls of the disciples for its theatre; finding an explanation of that state of mind in the natural reaction necessarily following the first impression of the death of Jesus, psychologically possible. They will attribute visions of the risen Jesus, narrated in the gospels, to popular imagination, conceiving that the memoirs could not but depict him in a form more or less corporeal. Feeling the force of objections to the reanimation of a body, of the contradictory statements of the evangelists, and the existence of a predisposition to visions in the first Christian believers, they will hesitate to accept the literal. Christianity does not fall with the denial of the resurrection. A thing surrounded with historial and other difficulties cannot be made a corner-stone in the edifice.

## CHARACTERISTICS.

1. Compared with Matthew, Luke has fewer original traditions, and his representations are less historical. He handles the materials freely; and his own reflectiveness appears more prominently. The discourses and facts are given in a shape not so primitive or faithful as they are in his predecessor. Thus the transfiguration of Jesus, which was a foretaste of his future glorification, is put too early. Instead of occupying its proper position in his life, as the culminating point of the revelation of

himself to the disciples, it is inserted in the midst of teachings respecting the kingdom of God and the Messiahship of Jesus. It comes, therefore, when the minds of the apostles were wholly unprepared for the occurrence, or rather for what it was meant to signify. Only a small part of Jesus's ministry was past when it took place, according to Luke; in Matthew that ministry was near its close; so that the disciples must have been more susceptible of the lesson it was meant to inculcate and the future it foreshadowed.

The narrative of the temptation in Luke is not so original as in Matthew. Instead of its succeeding acts forming a climax, the last being the strongest and most difficult, Luke gives the last place to the desire of Satan that Jesus should cast himself down from a pinnacle of the temple. 'Every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God' is altered into 'every word of God,' apparently to avoid anthropomorphism; and the addition, 'for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it,' indicates reflection on the extent of the devil's power.

The sermon on the mount is also given in an incomplete and fragmentary form. Originality does not belong to it here, though it has still some genuine parts. Being adapted to a later age and having a more general tendency, it shows reflectiveness. Even in Matthew, it has undergone alterations and received additions. In Luke it is not a comprehensive ethical discourse, as it is in Matthew, but treats of the way in which sinners should act under reproaches and persecutions, and be consoled.

In Luke xvii. 23 we see a modification of the corresponding part of Matthew. The words 'And they shall say to you, See here, or, See there: go not after them nor follow them,' are inappropriate in this context, and must have stood at first in a place where false Messiahs were spoken of. In like manner the twenty-fifth verse interrupts the connection, being a reminiscence of the

disciples wrongly inserted by the evangelist. Luke interprets the Greek word[1] in Matt. viii. 6, etc., incorrectly by *servant*[2] (Luke vii. 2), for which reason he adds 'who was dear to him.' But he allows the original word to remain in the seventh verse. There is no doubt that Matthew uses it for *son* (compare xvii. 18).

But while it is the rule that Luke's gospel presents a record less original than Matthew's, it is not without examples of words uttered and actions performed more correctly reported than they are in the first gospel. Thus in xviii. 19 the phrase 'Why callest thou me good' is original; while Matthew's 'Why dost thou ask me concerning the good' is a later modification.

2. The evangelist's leading object was mediating and conciliatory. He wished to bring Judaism and Paulinism together in the sphere of a comprehensive Christianity where the former would merge into the latter. In conformity with this purpose he describes the irreconcilable opposition between Jesus and his opponents, showing that Judaism was not the proper sphere in which his work could be realised. Jesus is not only the Jewish Messiah as he is in the first gospel, but the Redeemer of mankind (ii. 11; xxiv. 47); not merely the son of David but of God, bringing all men into a state of reconciliation to Him. The teaching of Jesus is not so much the leading theme of the evangelist, as His *person and work*, His manifestation as the Son of the Most High. The divinity of His person is connected with the divine origin and character of His work. He is an extraordinary being, working out a divine plan for the redemption of the human race, combating the higher spiritual world, expelling demons, and destroying the kingdom of Satan. The power of darkness, whose instruments are His Jewish opponents, is overthrown. It is this catholic tendency of the gospel that gives it a Pauline aspect, and has strengthened the belief of its author being a friend

[1] παῖς. [2] δοῦλος.

of the apostle. The writer conceives of Christ and Christianity in their relation to humanity, rather than to a particular people. Jewish exclusiveness disappears before a wider view of Jesus and his work; and the Son of man, whom Matthew depicts as taking away infirmities and sicknesses, appears as one who came to seek and save the lost. Such purpose on the part of Luke accounts for most peculiarities in the selection and arrangement of the materials which make up the gospel. It explains the nature of the work, not indeed by itself, but with the aid of written sources including Matthew's and other gospels.

3. A Pauline tendency in the gospel is apparent. In the time of the evangelist Christianity had overpassed the narrow limits of Judaism, showing its expansive spirituality. The apostle Paul had changed its primitive Judaic character for a higher and more liberal one. Hence Luke indicates the spiritual nature of the kingdom of God (xvii. 20), even in describing its origin. That his views are more comprehensive than Matthew's, appears not only in what he narrates but in what he omits—in the mode of his statements and the arrangement of his materials.

The right of the heathen to be received into the divine kingdom is always adduced. Thus Jesus came to seek and to save that which was lost (xix. 10). The genealogy is carried up to Adam, indicating that the human race had an interest in Christ, who is not said to be a king of the royal house of David, as in Matthew. This interest in the heathen appears in the prominence given to the Samaritans and the presence of Jews in their territory (ix. 52; xvii. 11). Jewish intolerance against that people is rebuked (ix. 55, 56); and they are placed in a favourable light over against the people of Israel (xvii. 11–19), even the priests and Levites. Seventy disciples were appointed, whose mission was to carry the gospel to the Gentiles, beyond the twelve

tribes of Israel to whom *the apostles* were specially charged to announce it (x.). This enlargement of the apostolic circle exhibits a view which regards the heathen as the objects of Jesus's original care not less than the Jews, and therefore creates a special mission. Hence some instructions addressed to the twelve in Matthew are transferred to the seventy; and others are omitted as those in Matt. x. 5, 6. The tendency to depreciate the twelve, in comparison with the seventy, is obvious in the ninth and tenth chapters; complimentary titles applied to the former in the first gospel receiving another and wider application. In like manner, the incident about Jesus paying tribute for the support of the temple-worship (Matt. xvii. 24–27), and the fact that saints rose from their graves at the death of Jesus and went into *the holy city* (xxvii. 51–53), are left out.

The same tendency is observable in the prominence given to free grace and mercy. Instead of the epithet *perfect* in the first gospel, which sounds like the phraseology of the law (v. 48), Luke has *merciful* (vi. 36); and in the parable of the prodigal son, the love of God towards sinners is depicted far in excess of the representation given by the first evangelist (Matt. xviii. 12–14). The same remark applies to the account of the woman who was a sinner (vii. 36–50), and to the narrative respecting Zaccheus (xix. 1–10), where the Pauline doctrine of grace is strongly set forth. The paragraph relating to the two malefactors (xxiii. 39–43), also shows the doctrine of justification by faith in opposition to works. What is said about the unprofitable servants (xvii. 10), as well as the subjective nature of the kingdom of God (xvii. 20, 21), is of the same character. The institution of the last supper (xxii. 14–19) is confessedly Pauline. And the appearances of the risen Saviour in Jerusalem show a dependence on 1 Cor. xv. 1–7. The Pauline tendency can hardly be mistaken by

the reader of the gospel, especially if the work be carefully compared with that of Matthew.

But the Pauline elements do not exclude passages of a different colour. Statements characteristically Jewish occur on several occasions, though they are subordinate and less numerous. The fact that the primitive Judaical representations are not effaced from the history are so far favourable to its originality. The evangelist's later views did not always mould authentic materials in a liberal way. But such fidelity has one disadvantage, that it leaves uncongenial elements in juxtaposition. To the original Jewish tradition belong the introductory history and account of the Temptation, the sayings condemning earthly riches and pronouncing the poor happy (vi. 20–25 ; xvi. 19–26), the recommending of deeds to procure a recompence (xvi. 9 ; xviii. 29, 30) ; the contrast of the present and future dispensations.[1] In like manner the perpetual duration of the law (xvi. 17),[2] and the future prospects presented to the disciples (xviii. 30), are Judaistic. So also the passages that recognise the law and the prophets (iv. 21 ; v. 14 ; xvi. 29–31 ; xvii. 14 ; xviii. 20 ; xxiii. 56 ; xxiv. 44), and the mild view of the old dispensation (v. 39).[3] The presence of these Judaistic elements, so far from prejudicing the historical character of the gospel, attests it, because they show the Jewish Christian ground on which the narratives first stood. The opposite Pauline tendency affects the credibility unfavourably. Some of the primitive or Judaistic materials have an Essene colouring, especially those in which Christ is the speaker. This accords with the very probable belief of Essene influence upon his early training. Thus in the parable of Dives and Lazarus,

[1] *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* and *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος* or *ἐκεῖνος*, xvi. 8; xviii. 30; xx. 34. 35.

[2] According to the usual reading.

[3] The last verse, however, is suspicious. It is wanting in Marcion, Eusebius, D. and MSS. of the old Latin version.

the former does not appear an unrighteous or wicked man, but merely rich—the latter, a miserably poor man, whose virtues, if he had any, are unmentioned. The one is punished in Hades because of his riches in this world ; the other is rewarded because of his poverty in the same. Such is the Essene idea conveyed in the parable itself ; and from it we have an indication of the speaker's education. In this gospel alone a woe is pronounced on the rich, and a blessing on the poor ; and the phrase 'unrighteous mammon' suggests the idea of something unholy in riches.

The twofold character of the materials to which we have now alluded is best seen in its contradictory aspect at xvi. 16, 17 : 'The law and the prophets were until John : since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.' The sixteenth verse gives a Pauline view of the law, viz. that Mosaism ceased with the Baptist, which cannot be the original sentiment ; and yet the perpetuity of the law in all its minutiæ is immediately subjoined. The words in Matthew, 'all the prophets and the law *prophesied* until John' are more original. Luke's object was to bridge over the ground between Jewish and Gentile Christians, by the introduction of a moderate Paulinism.

4. The evangelist has a considerable portion of new matter. Thus he has the parable of the two debtors (vii.), of the Good Samaritan (x.), of the friend going to another at night to borrow bread (xi.), the rich man who built large barns (xii.), of the barren fig-tree (xiii.), the lost piece of silver (xv.), the prodigal son (xv.), the unjust steward (xvi.), the rich man and Lazarus (xvi.), the unjust judge (xviii.), and the Pharisee and publican (xviii.). He records the miraculous draught of fishes (v.), the raising of the widow of Nain's son (vii.), the cure of a woman having a spirit of infirmity (xiii.), of a dropsical man (xiv.), of ten lepers

(xvii.), the conversion of Zaccheus (xix.), the healing of Malchus's ear (xxii.), and the journey of two disciples to Emmaus (xxiv.).

The first two chapters are also peculiar to him.

Besides these larger portions, many smaller incidents and traits are given by him alone, such as the questions put by the people to John the Baptist and his answers (iii. 10–14), the anointing of Jesus by the woman (vii. 36–50), his weeping over Jerusalem (xix. 39–44), the topic of Jesus's conversation with Moses and Elijah on the mount of transfiguration (ix. 28–36), the assurance to Simon that his faith should not fail (xxii. 31, 32), the bloody sweat (44), the fact of Jesus being sent to Herod (xxiii. 7–12), his words addressed to the women that followed him when he was led away to crucifixion (27–31), and the penitent thief (40–43). We also owe to Luke those affecting words, so appropriate and beautiful, which Jesus uttered as he expired, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' The language which Matthew puts into his lips, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' may be original, as it agrees with the epistle to the Hebrews, v. 7; but that given by Luke seems entitled to equal credit.

The principal omissions of Luke are Matt. xiv. 3–xvi. 12; xix. 1–12; xxi. 1–16, 20–28; xxvi. 6–13.

5. The part of Luke's gospel which is peculiar and in several respects embarrassing, is ix. 51–xviii. 14, commencing with Christ's preparation to depart from Galilee for Jerusalem, and ending before his arrival at Jericho. It is distinguished from the rest of the gospel, by its containing discourses rather than facts. The position which all the precepts, parables, and speeches here occupy, represents them as delivered in the interval between Christ's preparation to leave Galilee and his arrival at Jericho. Yet it is certain that some of the discourses and parables are put in a wrong place. Thus Jesus's lamentation over the fate of Jerusalem (xxiii.

34, 35), was uttered after his arrival there. Matthew says that it happened in the temple (xxiii. 37–39). The section begins with the announcement that Jesus is about to leave Galilee and go to Jerusalem through Samaria; but from x. 25 and onward He is still in Galilee. In ix. 53 the Samaritans are said to have refused Him hospitality, because His face was set for Jerusalem; yet this city was not the immediate, but remote object of His journey. The Galilean ministry of Jesus is presented in a different aspect by Luke from that of Matthew. The latter makes it proceed calmly in a natural order of development, till the time when the antagonism of His enemies had gathered strength to accomplish His death. Remote from the centre of Judaism, in a province of Palestine not much esteemed, Jesus is represented as actively engaged in His divine mission till the time had come that he should go to Jerusalem and meet the full force of Jewish enmity. Luke does not present the subject in this light. Instead of Jesus spending the greater part of His ministry in Galilee, the evangelist shortens His abode there to throw the main portion of that ministry into the journey which he took before suffering, dying, and rising again. Luke makes His death and resurrection the great end and object of His life. Hence this journey contains Jesus's chief conflicts with the Pharisees and scribes. The nearer he approaches Jerusalem, the more vehement and frequent do these conflicts become. Thus the materials are separated by Luke. The anti-Jewish side of Jesus's ministry is singled out and receives a more definite place by itself, instead of being thrown along with the general mass of the materials composing the evangelical history. How far the sources which Luke followed in these eight chapters contributed to their peculiar arrangement, it is impossible to know. One of them usually called a *gnomology*, was probably a collection of discourses which had been gradually

formed by accessions of new matter. Bishop Marsh has remarked, that throughout the whole of the long section (Luke ix. 51–xviii. 14) not one of the places in which parables and discourses were delivered is mentioned by *name*; and that therefore the gnomology had the same indefiniteness.[1] It is doubtful, however, whether that was a principal cause of Luke's ignoring the time when many of the discourses were delivered. The indefinite way in which places are mentioned (ix. 52; x. 38; xi. 1; xvii. 12) may be owing to the subjectivity of the evangelist, or his wish to be consistent by not naming places and times that would clash with the commencement. One thing is certain—that the writer was conscientious in altering the arrangement of the materials constituting the evangelical history rather than the materials themselves; though such arrangement disturbs symmetrical unity. The order of the first gospel is usually natural; that of the third artificial, the result of the evangelist's Pauline ideas.

6. Luke shows circumstantiality and exactness, in separating particulars and incidents which are grouped in Matthew. His pictorial power is considerable, especially in vii. 1–10 and viii. 41–56; but it is not equal to Mark's, though superior to Matthew's. In general his narrative is loose and unconnected, one event succeeding another without definite mark of time or proper formula of transition. This does not look as if he intended to mark chronolgical succession. Indefinite expressions are frequent, such as 'and it came to pass when he was in a certain city' (v. 12); 'and it came to pass on a certain day' (v. 17); 'and it came to pass also on another sabbath' (vi. 6); 'and one of the Pharisees desired him' (vii. 36); 'now it came to pass on a certain day' (viii. 22); 'now Herod the tetrarch heard of all,' etc. (ix. 7); 'it came to pass, as he was alone praying' (ix. 18); 'then there arose a reasoning

[1] Translation of *Michaelis*, vol. iii. part i. pp. 404, 405, 2nd ed.

among them' (ix. 46); 'and it came to pass that as he was praying in a certain place' (xi. 1); 'and he was casting out a devil' (xi. 14); 'and he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath' (xiii. 10); 'then said he' (xiii. 18); 'and it came to pass as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath day' (xiv. 1); 'and there went great multitudes with him' (xiv. 25); 'then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him' (xv. 1); 'and he said also unto his disciples' (xvi. 1); 'and when he was demanded of the Pharisees' (xvii. 20); 'and it came to pass that on one of those days' (xx. 1). This prominent feature attracts greater attention because of Luke's announcement to write everything in chronological succession. His sources did not furnish minute specifications of time, and he could not supply the deficiency. On the whole, the gospel is distinguished by its selection and arrangement of pre-existing materials, not by their thorough recast. They are modified, but not extensively. Instead of being moulded and melted afresh, they are exposed and distributed in a different way, without *radical transformation.* The tendency of the author does not reach a complete remodelling of the synoptic literature. His mediating spirit is that of the post-apostolic period, when strict Paulinism was diluted by concessions, and the sharp angles of opposing views had disappeared.

### RELATION BETWEEN THE GOSPEL AND THAT OF MARCION.

The connection of Marcion with the present gospel has been a fruitful source of discussion. That early heretic, as he is called, looked upon Paul as the only genuine apostle, and the primitive ones as corrupters of evangelical truth. In conformity with his peculiar views, he rejected all parts of the New Testament, except Paul's epistles. Discarding the gospels, he had one of his own, which he held to be the evangelical re-

cord used by Paul himself. The question is, What was Marcion's original gospel, sanctioned, as he affirmed, by Paul himself? Was it an independent document, older than the canonical Luke and the basis of it? This is the view upheld by Ritschl[1] and Baur[2] with great acuteness, and maintained with an amount of ingenuity which might have been more usefully applied. Was it the gospel of Luke, abridged and mutilated to suit his purpose? Such is the opinion of Tertullian, Irenæus, Epiphanius, and the fathers generally, which Volkmar[3] has proved with convincing arguments against Ritschl and Baur. The old opinion will not be seriously disturbed again while the treatise of Volkmar exists. Doctrinal motives led the Gnostic heretic to alter and mutilate the third gospel. The Pauline type of doctrine harmonised best with Marcion's anti-Jewish gnosis.

The use of Marcion's gospel now is to correct Luke's text, or to furnish at least some readings equal in value to those of ancient MSS. A few original ones may be collected from the fragments which remain. Thus in xi. 2, it is probable that his 'let thy Holy Spirit come' is original, instead of 'hallowed be thy name,' borrowed apparently from Matt. vi. 9. In x. 22, it is pretty certain that the original reading was 'no one *knew*[4] the Father, save the Son,' etc.; the present tense *knoweth* having got into the text from the use made of the aorist by the Gnostics. The same reading is implied in Justin.[5] It is also in the Clementine Homilies,[6] with a slight variation. According to Irenæus,[7] the Marcosians had it. Clement and Origen use it in almost all their citations, and Tertullian has *cognovit* (knew).[8]

[1] *Das Evangelium Marcion's und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas.* 1846.

[2] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien,* p. 397, *et seq.*

[3] *Das Evangelium Marcion's.* 1852.

[4] ἔγνω not γινώσκει.

[5] *Apol.* i. 63. *Dial.* 100.

[6] xvii. 4; xviii. 4, 13, 20.

[7] *Adv. Haer.* i. 20. 3.

[8] *Adv. Marcion.* ii. 27.

It is also highly probable that Marcion has preserved the original text in Luke xviii. 19, 'Why callest thou me good? One is good, the Father.'[1] The same applies to v. 39, which verse was omitted by Marcion; and the sense is better without it. In xvii. 2, it is doubtful whether the reading, 'it were good for him *if he had not been born*,'[2] be older than our present one. In xvi. 17, 'it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle *of my words* to fall;'[3] the originality of the phrase in italics is advocated by Baur and Hilgenfeld, not only because they suit the context, but because Tertullian seems to admit them and does not accuse his opponent of altering the text.

### TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

We have just seen that the gospel was prior to Marcion, i.e. before A.D. 130. An old witness to the existence of it has been found in the New Testament itself, viz. 1 Tim. v. 18, where we read, '*for the Scripture saith*, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, *The labourer is worthy of his hire.*' The formula, *The Scripture saith*, marks the words as a quotation; and the latter clause occurs only in Luke x. 7. The quotation does not carry the date of Luke up to the first century, nor beyond A.D. 110; for the first epistle to Timothy was not written by Paul.

It was regarded at first as the document of a private man, which put forth no claims to apostolicity or public authority; and Marcion introduced it into the circle of apostolic writings by using it as a primitive source of Pauline doctrine.

The work itself exhibits evidence of appearing after the destruction of Jerusalem. The *immediate* coming of the Son of man is not held forth. Thus when Mat-

[1] τί (or μή) με λέγετε ἀγαθόν; εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ.
[2] λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη.
[3] τῶν λόγων μου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν.

thew says, 'There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom,' Luke has, 'till they see the kingdom of God.' In Matthew, after Jesus had announced the impending destruction of Jerusalem, the apostles ask 'When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, *and of the end of the world*?' but in Luke the apostles merely repeat the first question about the destruction of Jerusalem, 'What sign will there be when these things (the destruction of Jerusalem) shall come to pass?' Matthew puts the destruction of Jerusalem and the second advent in close succession, '*immediately after* the tribulation of those days,' etc.; while Luke writes, 'These things must first come to pass, but the end is *not immediately*.' 'Before all these things they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you,' etc. It is also observable, that whereas Matthew makes the second coming succeed the desecration of the temple as a part of *the end* (xxiv. 14), Luke omits the words 'then shall the end come,' putting 'And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that *the desolation thereof is nigh*' (xxi. 20). A careful comparison shows that Luke separates two events which Matthew puts closely together. The destruction of Jerusalem was already past. xxi. 24 implies that Jerusalem had been trodden down by the Gentiles, *till their times should be fulfilled*. Experience had shown that no alteration or improvement in the existing state of things could be expected soon after the Jewish state was dissolved; but that the Roman yoke must be endured for a while. When this evangelist wrote, the Christians had been exposed to persecution, which is put before the wars and rebellions, reversing the order of succession given by Matthew, and showing that the latter had not occurred, though the persecutions had. The writer indicates a date posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem by changing the succession of events.

These considerations, along with the gospel's posteriority to that of Matthew, lead to the conclusion that it was not written before the beginning of the second century, perhaps about A.D. 110.

It is not easy to ascertain the birthplace of the document. Some phenomena favour Rome; others, Asia Minor. The former is more probable. The writer supposes that his readers were not well acquainted with Palestine, as we see from i. 26; iv. 31; xxiv. 13. But his geographical explanations cease, when the narrative relates to Italy (Acts xxviii.). Hence it is likely that he wrote in Rome. Köstlin's attempt to fix upon Ephesus has been refuted by Zeller; and the Achaia or Macedonia hypothesis of Hilgenfeld is as baseless as the Cæsarean one of Michaelis and Tholuck. If the gospel was written at Rome, Marcion got his first knowledge of it there.

## SOURCES.

Inquiry into the sources of Luke yields little profit. Beyond the very probable view that the evangelist used the canonical Matthew, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, there is much uncertainty. In ix. 51–xviii. 14, it is likely that written documents were employed; but it is impossible to ascertain their nature and number. The hypotheses of critics respecting Luke's sources are no more than guesses. Those of Scholten and Wittichen are untenable. Nor can Volkmar's be approved, though it seems a very simple thing to make Mark's the one source of Luke's gospel. Baur and Keim are nearer the truth; Hilgenfeld, by associating Mark with Matthew for the sources employed, is farther from it.

## FOR WHOM WRITTEN.

The immediate purpose for which the evangelist wrote was the instruction of Theophilus, who must have

been a Gentile, not a native or inhabitant of Palestine. The epithet translated *most excellent* prefixed to the name, has been thought to indicate rank, because it is assigned to Felix and Festus in the Acts. But it does not necessarily show that he was a man of eminence or authority. The word rather indicates the affectionate regard which the evangelist entertained for him.[1] The opinion that Theophilus lived in Italy, perhaps at Rome, has been favourably received. It is founded on his supposed acquaintance with the geography of Italy and Sicily, shown in Acts xxviii. And the fact that explanatory geographical remarks are wanting in the record of apostolic travels through Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece (Acts xiii.–xvi.), while the historian hastens to the conclusion in the latter part of the book, is supposed to favour the same view. Little weight belongs to that sort of proof. That the evangelist had a Gentile or Gentiles in view, is apparent from the tenor of the gospel. Many of his explanations would have been unnecessary for Jews, as 'the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, *which is called the passover*' (xxii. 1); 'and at night he went out, and abode in the mount *that is called the mount of Olives*' (xxi. 37); 'Capernaum, *a city of Galilee*' (iv. 31); '*a city of Galilee named* Nazareth' (i. 26); 'Arimathea, *a city of the Jews*' (xxiii. 51); 'the country of the Gadarenes, *which is over against Galilee*' (viii. 26); 'Emmaus, *which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs*' (xxiv. 13). He also appears to give the Greek inscription over the cross. The genealogy of Jesus is traced up to Adam, the common parent of the human family; while Matthew traces it to Abraham. The reigns of Roman emperors are also employed for marking the date of Jesus's birth and John's preaching. Again, while Matthew, referring to the Old Testament, speaks of what Moses *said*, or of that which was *spoken* by God, Luke refers to what is *written*. There

[1] It was not unusual to employ it as nearly synonymous with φίλτατος.

is, therefore, little doubt that the evangelist, himself a Gentile, wrote for Gentiles, as Origen long ago remarked. He meant to instruct Theophilus, that the friend might have a consecutive history on which he could rely.

## LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

The diction of the evangelist is the same in substance as that of the other synoptists; purer and less Hebraic, with the exception of the first two chapters. The preface is remarkably pure, presenting a contrast not only to the 1st chapter, which has many Hebraisms, but in a less marked degree to the whole of the gospel. It has therefore been thought, that had the author been at liberty to follow his own inclination or judgment, the work would have been composed in more classical Greek.

The three hymns in the 1st chapter, which are chiefly made up of passages from the Old Testament, are the most Hebraic; next to them, the speeches incorporated in the narrative; last of all, the narrative itself. The following are the leading peculiarities.

1. *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ*, i.e. וַיְהִי בְּ with an infinitive following, occurs twenty-three times; in Mark twice; not in Matthew. The construction *ἐν τῷ* with the infinitive occurs thirty-seven times in Luke; in Matthew thrice.

2. *ἐγένετο ὡς* in designations of time, six times; or *ὡς* without *ἐγένετο*, nine times.

3. *ἐγένετο δέ* or *καὶ ἐγένετο* with *καὶ* and *καὶ ἰδού*, ii. 6–9; v. 12, 17, 18; viii. 40, 41; ix. 29, 30, 37–39; xiv. 1, 2; xxiv. 4.

4. The combination of a protasis (such as *καὶ ἐν τῷ* with an infinitive or *καὶ ἐγένετο*) with an apodosis beginning with *καὶ* is peculiar to Luke, ii. 27, 28; v. 1.

5. Two substantives are united, the latter serving to explain the former. This is especially the case with *ἀδικία*, a word that does not occur in Matthew, but

which is four times in Luke: xiii. 27; xvi. 8, 9; xviii. 6. Similar combinations are *βάπτισμα μετανοίας* iii. 3; *πνεῦμα δαιμονίου* iv. 33.

6. The frequent use of *καρδία* answering to לֵב is seen in such phrases as *διατηρεῖν*, *συμβάλλειν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, *τίθεσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*.

7. *ὕψιστος*, עֶלְיוֹן, is applied to God five times. Mark has it once.

8. *οἶκος*, meaning *household*, *family*, בַּיִת, is peculiar to the third gospel and the Acts, though found in the epistles.

9. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*, מֵעַתָּה, occurs four times.

10. *νομικοί* is used six times for the customary *γραμματεῖς*, because more intelligible to Gentiles.

11. *ἐπιστάτης* for *ραββί*, also six times, shows a like preference.

12. *ἅπτειν λύχνον* or *πῦρ* instead of *καίειν λύχνον*, four times; not in Matthew or Mark.

13. The sea of Galilee is called *λίμνη*, not *θάλασσα*, five times.

14. *παραλελυμένος* occurs twice (or once, according to another reading). Matthew and Mark have always *παραλυτικός*.

15. The neuter participle with the article is frequently employed instead of a substantive, as in ii. 27; iv. 16; viii. 34; xxii. 22; xxiv. 14.

16. The infinitive with the genitive of the article, indicating design or result: i. 9, 57, 73; ii. 21, 27; v. 7; xii. 42; xxi. 22; xxii. 6, 31; xxiv. 16, 25, 29, twenty-five times in all. Mark has it once, and Matthew six times.

17. The substantive verb with a participle is often used for the finite verb: i. 10, 20, 21, 22; ii. 26, 51; iv. 16, 20, 31, 38, 44; v. 1, 11, 17, 18, 29; vi. 12; vii. 8; viii. 40; ix. 45, 53; xi. 14; xii. 52; xiii. 10, 11; xiv. 1; xv. 1; xvii. 35; xix. 47; xxi. 17, 24; xxiii. 12; xxiv. 13, 32; forty-eight times in all.

18. The use of δὲ καὶ for the sake of emphasis is frequent, as in ii. 4; iii. 9, etc.; twenty-nine times altogether.

19. εἰ δὲ μήγε occurs five times. Mark and John have only εἰ δὲ μή.

20. The neuter article is put before interrogatory clauses: i. 62; ix. 46; xix. 48; xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24.

21. The preposition σύν occurs very often, twenty-four times in the gospel, and fifty-one in the Acts. Matthew and Mark have μετά instead, or avoid the use of it.

22. ἀτενίζειν followed by εἰς, or with the dative: iv. 20; xxii. 56. Paul is the only other writer who has it twice, in the second epistle to the Corinthians.

23. εἰπεῖν πρός is very frequent in the gospel. λέγειν πρός also occurs. So does λαλεῖν πρός. The first is used elsewhere only in the fourth gospel. The same construction is found with other verbs, as ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἀπαγγέλλειν, συζητεῖν: λαλεῖν περί τινος also occurs four times, which the other synoptists avoid.

24. Participles are frequent, to give vividness to the narrative, as ἰδών, ἀναστάς, ἐγερθείς, στραφείς, ἐπιστρέψας, σταθείς, ἐπιστάς, ἑστώς, καθίσας, πεσών. Luke even puts two together without a copula, as ii. 36; iii. 23; iv. 20; v. 11, etc.

25. The evangelist shows a preference for verbs compounded with διὰ and ἐπί, as also for verbs compounded with two prepositions, such as διακατελέγχομαι.

26. ἀνήρ is used with substantives, as ἁμαρτωλός v. 8; xix. 7; and προφήτης xxiv. 19.

27. Ἱερουσαλήμ is commonly written; Ἱερουσόλυμα, which Mark and John alone have, being less frequent. Ἱερουσαλήμ is but once in Matthew, xxiii. 37.

28. χάρις occurs eight times in the gospel; in the Acts oftener. It is not in Matthew and Mark; and in John only three times.

29. εὐαγγελίζομαι often occurs. It is but once in Matthew; never in Mark or John.

30. ὑποστρέφειν occurs twenty-two times. In Matthew it is not found; and in Mark but once.

31. ἐφιστάναι is a favourite verb with the evangelist. It is not used in the other three gospels.

32. διέρχεσθαι is frequent in the gospel and the Acts. It occurs only twice in Matthew, Mark, and John respectively.

33. παραχρῆμα occurs very often. It is only twice in Matthew.

34. ἐνώπιον is twenty-one times in the gospel; once in John, and not in Matthew or Mark.

35. Luke in general is fond of words and expressions indicative of fulness, such as πλήρης, πληρόω, πλήθω, πληθύνω, πληροφορέω, etc.

36. ἔλεος occurs only in the neuter. Matthew uses it in the masculine.

37. Luke uses ἅπας frequently, though it seldom appears elsewhere. It occurs but nine times in the New Testament besides.

38. Luke is partial to καὶ αὐτός, as he uses it twenty-eight times. In Matthew it only occurs two or three times; in Mark four or five times. καὶ αὐτοί occurs thirteen times; in Mark not at all, and in Matthew but twice. αὐτὸς ὁ is used fourteen times by Luke, three times by Mark, and once by Matthew.

39. καὶ οὗτος five times. Only in Matt. xxvi. 71. Luke alone unites this pronoun with an interrogative or numeral without a connecting particle, as xvi. 2; xxiv. 26. He also puts ὅτι after τοῦτο x. 11; xii. 39, which Matthew and Mark never do. In one case ἵνα follows the latter, i. 43.

40. Luke is partial to the use of the infinitive with the article. Besides διὰ τό, which occurs much oftener than in Matthew and Mark, he has πρό and μετά with the infinitive.

41. τίς ἄρα, τί ἄρα, i. 66 ; viii. 25 ; xii. 42 ; xxii. 23, also in the Acts. In Mark twice, and in Matthew four times.

42. The form δοῦναι, with the dative of a person and accusative of a thing, is often employed, as in i. 73, etc.

43. ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός ii. 15 ; viii. 34. Mark has γεγονός but once, and then in a different construction from Luke.

44. μετὰ ταῦτα often occurs, but is in neither Matthew nor Mark.

45. The word στραφείς eight times. Only twice in Matthew.

46. πολλὰ ἕτερα iii. 18 ; xxii. 65.

47. Peculiar combinations with κατά. Thus Luke alone has κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, or κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός, or κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον. καθ' ἡμέραν five times. κατ' ἔτος ii. 41. The preposition is also used with the genitive in a peculiar way to denote place : iv. 14 ; xxiii. 5.

48. The individualising expressions εἰς τὰ ὦτα i. 44 ; ix. 44 ; ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν iv. 21 ; and εἰς τὰς ἀκοάς vii. 1.

49. Paraphrastic expressions with εὑρίσκειν v. 19 ; xix. 48 ; and ἔχειν τι ποιεῖν vii. 42 ; ix. 58 ; xi. 6 ; xii. 17, 50 ; xiv. 14.

50. καὶ ὅτε and καὶ ὡς often introduce the protasis.

51. The perfect participle of ἵστημι and its compounds is never ἑστηκώς, but always ἑστώς.

52. With respect to particles, μὲν οὖν and τε mark Luke's phraseology, though the latter occurs four times in Matthew, and once in Mark ; also καὶ γάρ and ἰδοὺ γάρ.

53. εἷς ἕκαστος peculiar to Luke.

54. τὰ περί τινος xxii. 37 ; xxiv. 19, 27 ; only in the epistles to the Philippians and Colossians besides.

55. The interrogative τίς ἄν i. 62 ; vi. 11 ; ix. 46.

56. νομίζειν with the accusative and infinitive after it.

57. Luke often uses a plural relating to a preceding πλῆθος, as xix. 37.

58. λαλεῖν ῥῆμα i. 65 ; ii. 17, 50 ; only in Matt. xii. 36.

59. Of all the New Testament writers, Luke has oftenest the relative of attraction. There are examples in which the relative pronoun adapts its case to that of πᾶς immediately preceding : iii. 19 ; ix. 43 ; xix. 37 ; xxiv. 25.

60. Luke is fonder of the optative than others, in the indirect construction : i. 29, 62 ; iii. 15 ; vi. 11 ; ix. 46 ; xv. 26 ; xviii. 36 ; xxii. 23.

61. The name of the father without the article is put after θυγάτηρ i. 5 ; ii. 36 ; xiii. 16 ; xxiii. 28. This appears elsewhere only in citations : Matt. xxi. 5 ; John xii. 15 ; Hebr. xi. 24.

62. Combinations with ἡμέρα, especially ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων or τοῦ σαββάτου : iv. 16 ; xiii. 14, 16 ; xiv. 5.

63. πρὶν ἤ is connected with the conjunctive in ii. 26 ; perhaps in xxii. 34. Elsewhere it is always followed by the infinitive.

64. No other evangelist speaks of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον as often as Luke, who has peculiar expressions along with it, such as πλησθῆναι πνεύματος ἁγίου.

65. Luke employs τὸ εἰρημένον in citations, where Matthew has τὸ ῥηθέν : ii. 24 ; Acts ii. 16 ; xiii. 40. So also εἴρηται iv. 12. εἴρηκεν xxii. 13. Only Matthew has εἰρηκώς xxvi. 75.

66. Luke has νῦν where Matthew has ἄρτι. The latter he never employs.

67. ἀμφότεροι occurs six times, three times in the Acts. In Matthew three times.

68. ἀναιρεῖν xxii. 2 ; xxiii. 32. Only once in Matthew.

69. ἀνιστάναι, especially the forms ἀνέστη, ἀναστάς, etc., are much commoner in Luke than in the other evangelists.

70. ἅπας twenty times in the gospel alone, and nearly as many in the Acts. In Matthew and Mark three times each.

71. ἄχρι four times. Except Matt. xxiv. 38, the other evangelists have μέχρι.

72. βοᾶν three times, and once in a quotation. The other evangelists have it only in quotations.

73. βραχίων except in Luke only once in John.

74. δεῖ. Luke uses it oftener than all the New Testament writers together, and especially with μέ, ii. 49, etc.

75. δέομαι, only in Matt. ix. 38 besides.

76. δέχεσθαι fifteen times. In Matthew six, and in Mark three times.

77. διανοίγειν ii. 23 ; xxiv. 31, 32, 45. Only in Mark vii. 34, 35, besides.

78. διατάσσειν, only once in Matthew besides.

79. διό i. 35 ; vii. 7 ; and ten times in the Acts. Only once in Matthew, not in Mark.

80. δοξάζειν τὸν Θεόν eight times. Twice in Matthew, and once in Mark.

81. ἐᾶν iv. 41 ; xxii. 51. In the Acts eight times. Only once in Matthew.

82. ἔθος three times. Once in John.

83. εἰσάγειν, only once in John, but frequent in Luke. Not in Matthew or Mark.

84. εἰσφέρειν four times, and once in the Acts. Matthew has it once.

85. ἐλπίζειν three times, in the Acts twice. Once in Matthew and once in John.

86. ἐναντίον, only in Mark besides, ii. 12, where the reading is doubtful.

87. ἐνθάδε xxiv. 41, and five times in the Acts. Elsewhere only in John iv. 15, 16.

88. ἐνώπιον twenty times. Not in Matthew or Mark; and only once in John.

89. ἐξαίφνης ii. 13; ix. 39; the Acts. Only in Mark xiii. 36 besides.

90. ἐπαίρειν six times. Once in Matthew, four times in John.

91. ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι five times. Once in Matthew, and once in Mark.

92. ἐπιπίπτειν i. 12; xv. 20, eight times in the Acts. Not in Matthew. In Mark once. In John once.

93. ἐπισκέπτεσθαι three times in the gospel, and three times in the Acts. Twice in Matthew, but in no other evangelist.

94. ἔτος, a favourite word. Only once in Matthew, and twice in Mark.

95. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ten times. Only once in Matthew.

96. εὐλογεῖν τινα ii. 34; vi. 28; ix. 16; xxiv. 50–53. Once in Matthew (?), and once in Mark.

97. ἡγεῖσθαι xxii. 26. In the Acts, four times. Only in the citation Matt. ii. 6 besides.

98. θαυμάζειν ἐπί τινι four times. Once in Mark.

99. ἱκανός nine times. Eighteen times in the Acts. Three times each in Matthew and Mark.

100. ἱματισμός twice, once in the Acts. Matt. xxvii. 35 ?

101. καθαιρεῖν three times, and in the Acts three times. Twice in Mark.

102. κατανοεῖν four times. Once in Matthew.

103. καταφιλεῖν three times in the gospel, and once in the Acts. One in Matthew and Mark each.

104. κονιορτός twice in the gospel, and twice in the Acts. Once in Matthew.

105. κτᾶσθαι twice, in the Acts three times. Once in Matthew.

106. λατρεύειν three times. Five times in the Acts. Once in Matthew in a quotation.

107. λιμός four times. Once in Matthew, and once in Mark.

108. οἰκουμένη three times. The Acts, five times; Matthew, once.

109. ὄρθρος once in the gospel, and once in the Acts. In John viii. 2 ?

110. πέμπειν frequent in Luke. Only once in Mark, and four times in Matthew.

111. πλῆθος, a favourite word, especially with πᾶν τὸ before it. It occurs only in the singular. Mark iii. 7, 8.

112. ποιεῖν τινί τι i. 25, 49; viii. 39. τι μετά τινος, i. 58, 72; x. 37; the Acts. Such expressions as ποιεῖν κράτος i. 51; λύτρωσιν i. 68; ἔλεος i. 72; x. 37; ἐκδίκησιν xviii. 7, 8.

113. προσδοκᾶν six times. Matthew, twice.

114. προστιθέναι often. Twice in Matthew, and twice in Mark.

115. συγκαλεῖν four times. Mark, once.

116. συλλαμβάνειν seven times. In Matthew and Mark once each.

117. συνέχειν six times. Once in Matthew.

118. τύπτειν five times. Matthew twice. Mark once.

119. ὑπάρχειν seven times in the gospel, and much oftener in the Acts; but not in the other gospels.

120. ὑποδεικνύναι three times in the gospel, and twice in the Acts. Matthew has it once.

121. φυλάσσειν six times. Once in Matthew and Mark each.

122. χαλᾶν twice in the gospel, three times in the Acts. Once in Mark.

123. Several Latin words are used by the evangelist: δηνάριον vii. 41; λεγεών viii. 30; σουδάριον xix. 20; ἀσσάριον xii. 6; μόδιος xi. 33.

124. The following are used by Luke alone among the evangelists :—

ἄβυσσος, ἀγαλλίασις, ἀγκάλη, ἄγρα, ἀγραυλεῖν, ἀγωνία, ἀηδία (?), αἴτιον, αἰχμάλωτος, ἀλλογενής, ἀμπελουργός, ἀμφιάζειν (?), ἀνάγειν, ἀνάγεσθαι to set sail, ἀναδεικνύναι, ἀνάδειξις, ἀνάθημα, ἀναίδεια, ἀναζητεῖν, ἀνακαθίζειν, ἀνάληψις, ἀνάπηρος, ἀναπράσσειν (?), ἀναπτύσσειν (?), ἀνάπτειν, ἀνασπᾶν, ἀνατάσσεσθαι, ἀναφαίνεσθαι, ἀναφωνεῖν, ἀνέκλειπτος, ἀνένδεκτος, ἀνευρίσκειν, ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι, ἀνορθοῦν, ἀντειπεῖν, ἀντιβάλλειν, ἀντικαλεῖν, ἀντιλέγειν, ἀντιπαρέρχεσθαι, ἀντιπέραν, ἀνώτερον, ἀξιοῦν, ἀπαιτεῖν, ἀπαλλάσσειν, ἀπαρτισμός, ἀπογράφειν to tax, ἀπογραφή, ἀποδέχεσθαι, ἀποθλίβειν, ἀποκλείειν, ἀπολείχειν, ἀπομάσσειν, ἀποπλύνειν (?), ἀπορία, ἀποστοματίζειν, ἀποτελεῖν (?), ἀποτινάσσειν, ἀποψύχειν, ἄρς, ἄροτρον, ἀρχιτελώνης, ἀστράπτειν, ἄτεκνος, ἀτενίζειν, ἄτερ, ἄτοπος, ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον, αὐστηρός, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖν, αὐτόπτης, ἄφαντος, ἄφρος, ἀφυπνοῦν, ἀχάριστος, βαθέως, βαθύνειν, βαλάντιον, βαρύνειν (?), τὰ βασίλεια, βάτος, βελόνη, βολή, βορρᾶς, βουλὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, βουνός, βραδύς, βραχύς, βρέχειν to moisten, βρέφος, βρώσιμος, βύσσος, γείτων, γελᾶν, γῆρας, γίνεσθαι σύν τινι, γνωστός known, δακτύλιον, δανειστής, δαπάνη, δέησις, δεσμεῖν and τὰ δέσμα, δεσπότης in addressing God, δευτερόπρωτος, διαβαίνειν, διαβάλλειν, διαγνωρίζειν, διαγογγύζειν, διαγρηγορεῖν, διαδιδόναι, διακονία, διαλαλεῖν, διαλείπειν, διαμαρτύρεσθαι, διαμερισμός, διανεύειν, διανόημα, διανυκτερεύειν, διαπορεῖν, διαπραγματεύεσθαι, διασείειν, διαταράσσειν, διατηρεῖν, διατίθεσθαι, διαφυλάττειν, διαχωρίζεσθαι, διήγησις, διϊστάναι, διϊσχυρίζεσθαι, δικαστής, διοδεύειν, διότι, δόγμα, δούλη, δοχή, δραχμή, Ἑβραϊκός, ἐγκάθετος, ἔγκυος, ἐδαφίζειν, ειθίσμένον, ἐκκομίζειν, ἐκκρέμασθαι, ἐκλείπειν, ἐκμάσσειν, ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, ἐκτελεῖν, ἐκτενέστερον, ἐκφέρειν, ἐκχωρεῖν, ἕλκος, ἑλκοῦν, Ἑλληνικός, ἐμβάλλειν, ἐμπιμπλάναι, ἔμφοβος, ἔναντι, ἐνδέχεσθαι, ἐνεδρεύειν, ἐνεῖναι, ἐνισχύειν, ἐννύειν, ἐνοχλεῖν, ἐξαιτεῖσθαι, ἐξαστράπτειν, ἐξῆς, ἐπαγγελία, ἐπαθροίζεσθαι, ἐπαιτεῖν, ἐπανέρχεσθαι, ἐπειδήπερ, ἐπεισέρχεσθαι, ἐπέρχεσθαι, ἐπιβιβάζειν, ἐπιβλέπειν, ἐπιδεῖν, ἐπικεῖσθαι, ἐπικρίνειν, ἐπιλείχειν, ἐπιμελῶς, ἐπιπνίγειν, ἐπιπορεύεσθαι,

ἐπιῤῥίπτειν, ἐπισιτισμός, ἐπισχύειν, ἐπιφωνεῖν, ἐπιχειρεῖν, ἐπιχέειν, αἱ ἔρημοι the wilderness, ἐσθής, ἔσθησις (?), ἐσπέρα, εὐεργέτης, εὔθετος, εὐλαβής, εὑρίσκειν χάριν, εὐτόνως, εὐφορεῖν, εὐφραίνειν, ἐφημερία, ζεῦγος, ἡγεμονεύειν, ἡγεμονία, ἡμιθανής, τὸ ἦχος, θάμβος, θεῖον, θεμέλιον, θεωρία, θραύειν, θρόμβος, θυμίαμα, θυμιᾶν, ἴασις, ἱδρώς, ἱερατεία, ἱερατεύειν, ἱκμάς, ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἴσως, κάδος, καθεξῆς, καθιέναι, καθοπλίζεσθαι, καθότι, κακοῦργος, καταβαίνειν μετά τινος, κατάβασις, καταδέειν, κατακλείειν, κατακλίνειν, κατακολουθεῖν, κατακρημνίζειν, καταλιθάζειν, κατανεύειν, κατακλείειν, κατασύρειν, κατασφάττειν, καταψύχειν, κατέρχεσθαι, κατηχεῖν, κέραμος, κέρας, κεράτιον, κηρίον, κλάσις (τοῦ ἄρτου), κλίνει ἡ ἡμέρα, κλινίδιον, κλισία, κομίζειν actively, κοπρία and κόπριος, κόραξ, κόρος, κραιπάλη, κράτιστος, κράτος, κρύπτη, λαμπρῶς, λαξευτός, λεῖος, λῆρος, λίμνη, λυσιτελεῖ, λυτροῦν, λύτρωσις, μακαρίζειν, μακρός, μαστός, μεγαλεία, μεγαλειότης, μελίσσιος, μεριστής, μετεωρίζεσθαι, μέτοχος, μήν, μίσθιος, μνᾶ, μόγις, νομοδιδάσκαλος, νότος, ὅδε, ὁδεύειν, ὀδυνᾶσθαι, οἰκοδομεῖν, οἰκτίρμων, οἰκονόμος, οἰκονομία, οἰκονομεῖν, ὄμβρος, ὁμιλεῖν, ὄνειδος, ὁπότε, ὀπτός, ὀρεινός, ὀρθρίζειν, ὄρθριος, οὐσία, ὀφρύς, ὀχεῖσθαι, παγίς, παιδεύειν, ἡ παῖς, παλαιοῦν, παμπληθεί, πανδοχεῖον, πονδοχεύς, παντελές, παραβιάζεσθαι, παράδοξον, παραιτεῖσθαι, παρακαθίζειν, παρακαλύπτειν, παρακύπτειν, παράλιος, παραλύεσθαι, παρατήρησις, παρθενία, παροικεῖν, πατεῖν, παύεσθαι, πεδίνος, πενιχρός, περιέχειν, περιζώννυσθαι, περικρύπτειν, περικυκλοῦν, περιλάμπειν, περιοικεῖν, περίοικος, περιπίπτειν, περισπᾶσθαι, πήγανον, πιέζειν, πινακίδιον, πλεῖν, πλήμμυρα, πλουτεῖν, πλύνειν, ποίμνιον, πολίτης, πορεία, ποτέ sometimes, ever, πράκτωρ, πρεσβεία, πρεσβυτέριον, προβάλλειν, προδότης, προκόπτειν, προμελετᾶν, προπορεύεσθαι, προσάγειν, προσαναβαίνειν, προσαναλίσκειν προσδαπανᾶν, προσδοκία, προσεργάζεσθαι, προσέχειν ἑαυτοῖς, προσποιεῖσθαι, προσρήγνυμι, προσψαύειν, προυπάρχειν, προφέρειν, προφῆτις, πτοεῖσθαι, πτύσσειν, πυκνός, ῥῆγμα, ῥῆμα plural, ῥομφαία, σάλος, σιγᾶν, σίκερα,

σινιάζειν, σιτευτός, σιτομέτριον, σκάπτειν, σκιρτᾶν, σκορπίος, σκῦλον, σορός, σπαργανοῦν, σπεύδειν, σπλάγχνα, στεῖρα, στηρίζειν, στρατηγός, στρατιά, στρατόπεδον, συγγένεια, συγκαλύπτειν, συγκύπτειν, συγκυρία, συκάμινος, συκομορέα, συκοφαντεῖν, συλλογίζεσθαι, συμβάλλειν, συμπαραγίνεσθαι, συμπίπτειν, συμπληροῦν, συμφωνία, συναθροίζειν, συναντᾶν, συναρπάζειν, συνεῖναι, συνιέναι, συνοδία, συντυγχάνειν, συσπαράττειν, σωτήρ and σωτηρία, ταχέως, τάχος, τελειοῦν, τελείωσις, τελεσφορεῖν, τετραπλοῦς, τετραρχεῖν, τραῦμα, τρυγᾶν, τρυγών, τρυφή, τυγχάνειν, τυρβάζεσθαι, ὑγρός, ὑδρωπικός, ὑπάρχειν, Matthew has only τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, ὑπερεκχύνεσθαι, ὑπερήφανος, ὑποδέχεσθαι, ὑπολαμβάνειν, ὑπομονή, ὑποστρωννύειν, ὑποτάσσειν, ὑποχωρεῖν, ὕψος, φάραγξ, φάτνη, φίλημα, φόβητρον, φρονίμως, φύειν, χαλᾶν, χάραξ, χάρις, χάσμα, χόρος, χρᾶν, χρεωφειλέτης, ψώχειν, ὠόν.[1]

Luke's diction is comparatively easy and correct. Awkward constructions such as are found in Matthew and Mark are generally avoided. Thus, instead of βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς (Mark xii. 38), Luke has φιλούντων before ἀσπασμούς, which takes away the harshness. Again: for ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας (Matt. viii. 9) Luke has τασσόμενος after ἐξουσίαν, obviating the harshness and obscurity. Compare also the words of Matthew, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσι τὸν Ἰωάννην (xxi. 26), which are not good Greek, with those of Luke: ὁ λαὸς . . . πεπεισμένος ἐστὶν Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι.

The difference of style between the gospel and the Acts is perceptible, the advantage being on the side of the latter, where we find more ease, the result of practice. As the preface of the gospel is written in purer Greek than the gospel itself, there is a difference between the former and latter portions of the Acts—those relating to

[1] See Zeller's *Theologische Jahrbücher*, vol. ii. p. 450, *et seq.*

transactions not described by a companion of Paul, and such as were taken by the evangelist from the diary of a fellow-traveller of the apostle.

### THE TAXING OF QUIRINIUS, IN ITS BEARING ON THE DATE OF THE NATIVITY.

'And it came to pass in those days that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city,' etc. (ii. 1–3).

Here we remark :—

1. That a general census, embracing the Roman empire and commanded by Augustus, is referred to. Yet no contemporary historian mentions it. Dion Cassius, Suetonius, the Ancyra monument, allude to censuses of the Roman citizens, or to separate provincial valuations; but a universal one is unknown.

2. The census of Quirinius took place about ten years after the birth of Jesus, and eleven or twelve years after Archelaus was deposed. This appears from Josephus. Hence it could not have happened at the time of Jesus's birth.

Two explanations are possible: either that the census of Quirinius has been erroneously transferred to the period of Christ's birth; or that there was a prior one unnoticed by contemporary historians, to which Luke refers. Attempts to justify the account which the evangelist gives are not wanting. It has been supported in different ways, but they may all be reduced to two, viz. an explanation on the basis either of one census, or of two.

(*a.*) Some undertake to explain the passage by the well-known census of Quirinius (A.D. 6 or 7). Admitting that an edict was issued by Augustus in the days of Herod for a general registration of the Roman empire

with a view to taxation, and assuming that it included Judea, they say that though Herod took measures for its execution, he prevented its actual accomplishment in the kingdom over which he reigned; so that it was not carried into effect till after his death, i.e. after the deposition of Archelaus and Quirinius's appointment over Syria. Agreeably to this, the words of Luke are translated, 'This census, a first one, was completed (took effect) when Quirinius was governor of Syria.' Stress is laid upon the two words *first* and *was*; the former being emphasised along with the pronoun *this*, and the latter denoting, *was carried into effect.* The construction is unnatural; the plain meaning being 'this first census took place when Quirinius was governor of Syria.' A slight variation of the text turns the pronoun *this* into *itself* by the change of a spirit:[1] '*the census itself* first took effect;' or, '*the first census itself* took effect.' The immediate context which describes the progress of the census is against this manipulation. The idea of a census having begun without being completed till ten years after, is in itself highly improbable. So is Herod's conjectural retarding of it.

Others translate, 'This census took place *before* Quirinius was governor of Syria,' rendering a superlative as a comparative.[2] That construction would require an infinitive, whereas a participle is used. It is affirmed, however, that the one stands for the other; a supposition creating two peculiarities in the same sentence. The masters of Hellenistic Greek, Winer, Fritzsche, and Buttmann, pronounce the construction impossible. Alleged instances of similar usage in John i. 15, 30, xv. 18, are not analogous, because the superlative is there coupled with a noun; neither is the Septuagint example in Jeremiah xxix. 2, to the point, since it has a genitive absolute. The proposed construction is ungrammatical.

[1] αὐτὴ for αὕτη.

[2] πρώτη for προτέρα.

(*b.*) Others undertake an explanation on the basis of a twofold governorship of Syria. Can this be historically maintained? Many think so. In 1764 the fragment of an inscription on a gravestone found near Tibur (Tivoli)[1] states that the person to whom it was dedicated was proconsul of Asia and twice governor of Syria and Phœnicia.[2] Although the name Quirinius does not appear in it, Sanclemente, Bergmann, Nipperdey, and Mommsen refer it to him; but Zumpt believes that the person meant is Sextius Saturninus,[3] and Huschke, Agrippa. The difficulty lies in finding room for Quirinius's first proconsulship of Syria before Herod's death, which took place in the spring of 750 A.U.C. or 4 B.C. Varus was appointed to that office in 748; was he soon displaced by Quirinius? There is no evidence that he was. Various expedients are adopted in order to find Quirinius's administration of Syria a place at the time of Christ's birth. He subdued the Homonadenses in Cilicia; and as Syria had been probably annexed to that country, he may have been proconsul of it. This is Mommsen's opinion;[4] and Zumpt agrees with it.

[1] The editor of the *Speaker's Commentary* says that this stone was found *in the Tiber!*

[2] Mommsen gives it thus:—

. . . . gem qua redacta inpot . . .
Augusti populique Romani senat . . . .
supplicationes binas ob res prosp . . . . .
ipsi ornamenta triumph . . . . . .
proconsul Asiam provinciam op . . . . .
divi Augusti terum Syriam et Ph . . . .

*i.e.* regem qua redacta in potestatem Augusti populique Romani senatus supplicationes binas ob res prospere gestas et ipsi ornamenta triumphalia decrevit proconsul Asiam provinciam optinuit leg. divi Augusti iterum Syriam et Phœniciam.

Should not *iterum* have come after 'Syriam et Phœniciam,' if a twofold proconsulship were meant? Strauss thinks so. See *Die Halben und die Ganzen*, p. 70, etc.; and R. Hilgenfeld's article in the *Zeitschrift* of his father for 1880, p. 104, etc.

[3] See *Commentationum epigraphicarum ad antiquitates Romanas pertinentium volumen alterum*, 1854, pp. 73–150.

[4] *Res gestæ divi Augusti*, p. 121.

Or he may have been governor though absent;[1] in other words, while Varus was still acting as proconsul, he was *the nominated* proconsul, though he had not gone abroad to enter upon his office in person. Such is Aberle's curious view.[2] Some who date Quirinius's appointment in 4 B.C. bring him back in 2 B.C., when he was selected as *rector* of Caius Cæsar. Mr. Lewin does so.[3] Thus the first proconsulship occasions many hypotheses unsupported by history. The gap in Dion Cassius from 6 B.C. till 4 A.D., to which there is a corresponding one in Josephus, can only be filled up by conjecture. We can follow Varus's proconsulship of Syria till 4 B.C.; all after is obscure. It is just in that year, however, that Zumpt makes Quirinius succeed him, but only for three years or less. This learned writer is too hasty in deriving the first proconsulship from Tacitus himself;[4] for the historian does not say that when Quirinius was rector of Caius Cæsar he was also governor of Syria.

Though the double governorship could be proved, the difficulty of Quirinius's undertaking a census of Judea in his first term of office remains. Mommsen himself, who believes that Quirinius was proconsul of Syria 751, 752 A.U.C., asserts that a Roman census was not held twice in that country. Some apologists, conscious of the weak ground on which the first governorship rests, are content to make him carry out the census in another capacity, as *an extraordinary commissioner* deputed for the purpose. They are met, however, by the objection, that a prudent emperor like Augustus would not have offered such indignity to Herod.

Weitzsäcker supposes that Luke may have known of

[1] 'Magistratus eponymus.'
[2] *Theologische Quartalschrift* for 1865, p. 103, etc.
[3] *Fasti Sacri*, p. 134.
[4] *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, pp. 20–72.

Quirinius's first proconsulship and transferred the census to it without the suspicion of a mistake. Perhaps the adjective *first* lends some countenance to this improbable hypothesis.[1]

On the whole question we observe :—

1. A census of the Roman empire including the provinces, instituted by Augustus, is unhistorical. He issued an edict to that effect three times during his reign ; but it was limited to the Roman citizens alone, and was a *census populi*.

2. A Roman census at the birth of Jesus must have been held when Herod was King of Judea. In countries not yet reduced to the form of Roman provinces but governed by *reges socii*, the latter superintended a census. It would have been an insult to issue such an edict, independently of their active concurrence. It has been conjectured, indeed, that Augustus may have done so when he was displeased with Herod ; and Josephus is appealed to for expressions which the emperor used in a letter addressed to him B.C. 7 ;[2] but these utterances of temporary anger did not affect the rank of Herod. The emperor being soon reconciled to him, he continued to be a *rex socius*, without losing that position. To account for the issuing of the decree or its enforcement, by the displeasure of Augustus with Herod, is purely conjectural.

3. A census of the Roman empire before Judea was converted into a proper Roman province, which was in 759 A.U.C., must have been conducted according to Roman usage, which did not require the parents of Jesus to travel from Nazareth in Galilee to Bethlehem in Judea. Least of all was the personal appearance of females necessary. A Roman census was regulated by the place of abode. But Joseph did not live at Bethlehem, according to Luke. It has been said that the cen-

[1] See Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, vol. v. p. 27.

[2] *Antiqq.* xvi. 9. 3.

sus was a Jewish one, and conducted in Jewish fashion, and therefore Joseph went to the place whence his family had sprung. Still this did not require Mary's presence. Should it be said that she was an heiress and had to appear on that account, all the evidence we have attests her poverty.

4. The supposed census-taking by Quirinius at the birth of Christ, in any capacity but that of real governor of Syria, as *legate of Cæsar* or *extraordinary commissioner*, does not consist with the plain language of the sacred writer. And that he was twice governor of the country cannot be shown. Saturninus seems to have been proconsul at the time.

5. In Acts v. 37, Luke speaks of the taxing of Quirinius. He knew the one transaction; his cognisance of an earlier was vague; or rather, he followed a confused tradition which threw back Quirinius's later government and taxing of Syria to an earlier time, as though something of the same nature had been done in that region before.

6. Notwithstanding the great amount of learning brought to bear upon the subject, especially by Wieseler, Zumpt, Aberle, Köhler and others, all intent on warding off the charge of misstatement from the evangelist, it is impossible for a simple reader to avoid believing that Luke puts the census of Quirinius about ten years too early. This is not the only mistake in the writings of the same author. Explanations of the passage on the assumption of its agreement with the census of Quirinius, A.D. 6 or 7, are forced or ungrammatical; and that which adopts an earlier proconsulship with a contemporaneous census requires more historical confirmation than has been produced. It is possible that while Luke speaks of the later one in Acts v. 7, he records the earlier one in the gospel; but this is not probable. Why was the former followed by no resistance on the part of the Jews, as the latter was? Did they tamely sub-

mit to it? To put it in the time of Herod is all but impossible. Well does Keim say that the attempts of Hengstenberg, Gerlach, and Aberle to help the historical accuracy of Luke, are cuffs in the face of history.

### INTEGRITY.

It was once thought that the first two chapters, with the exception of the preface, were not written by the evangelist. The only argument worth mentioning which was adduced against them is their absence from Marcion's gospel. But as Tertullian says that the same document wanted the 3rd chapter, and the 4th as far as the thirty-first verse, the argument proves too much. Besides, Marcion's gospel was a mutilated copy of Luke's.

### QUOTATIONS.

These are :—

| | |
|---|---|
| i. 17 . . | Mal. iv. 6. |
| ii. 23 . . | Exod. xiii. 2. |
| ii. 24 . . | Levit. xii. 8. |
| iii. 4–6 . . | Isai. xl. 3–5. |
| iv. 4 . . | Deut. viii. 3. |
| iv. 8 . . | Deut. vi. 13. |
| iv. 10, 11 . | Psalm xc. 11, 12. |
| iv. 12 . . | Deut. vi. 16. |
| iv. 18, 19 . | Isai. lxi. 1, 2. |
| vii. 27 . . | Mal. iii. 1. |
| viii. 10 . . | Isai. vi. 9, 10. |
| x. 27 . . | Deut. vi. 5; Levit. xix. 18. |
| xiii. 35 . . | Psalm cxviii. 26. |
| xviii. 20 . | Exod. xx. 13–15. |
| xix. 46 . . | Isai. lvi. 7. |
| xx. 17 . . | Psalm cxviii. 22. |
| xx. 28 . . | Deut. xxv. 5. |
| xx. 37 . . | Exod. iii. 6. |
| xx. 42, 43 . | Psalm cx. 1. |
| xxii. 37 . . | Isai. liii. 12. |
| xxiii. 30 . . | Hosea x. 8. |
| xxiii. 46 . . | Psalm xxi. 5. |

The citations are few compared with those of Matthew, which the character of the gospel sufficiently accounts for. Almost all occur in the sayings of Christ and others; nor is any made to prove the fulfilment of prophecy, which would have been useless for Gentile readers. All are from the Septuagint, with one exception, viz. vii. 27. Here Ritschl is right in perceiving

the dependence of Luke on Matthew, who has the citation in the same form. Holtzmann explains it by arbitrarily assuming a difference of sources, as if Luke departed from his usual method in this instance, and followed another document.

# THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

## NOTICES OF THE ALLEGED AUTHOR.

On the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, at Capernaum, lived Andrew and Simon, fishermen, the sons of one Jonas. The former was attracted by the preaching of John the Baptist; there is no evidence that Peter was his disciple. Andrew brought his brother to Jesus, who gave him the name Cephas or Peter, i.e. a rock.

During the life and ministry of the Master, Peter occupied the most prominent position among the apostles and was honoured with many marks of his confidence. After the ascension, he appears again as the most conspicuous of the brethren. When the church at Jerusalem was scattered by persecution, he was sent with John to Samaria. But the metropolis was his usual place of abode. Having been delivered from prison, he probably left the city (Acts xii. 1–17); and it is not known whither he went, to Cæsarea, Antioch, or Arabia. Wherever he was, there is little doubt of his preaching to the Jews. Subsequently we find him again in Jerusalem at the so-called council (Acts xv.), after which he visited Antioch, where he gave offence by refusing to eat with converted Gentiles and was openly rebuked by Paul. This is his last appearance in sacred history.

It is clear that he was married (Luke iv. 38); and his house is mentioned in Matthew's gospel (viii. 14). Some suppose the Marcus of the first epistle to have

been his son ; it is more probable that he was his *spiritual* son and identical with Mark the evangelist.

Ancient witnesses state that he visited Asia Minor, Corinth, and Rome. Origen and Eusebius refer to his activity in Asia Minor ; but obviously by inference from 1 Peter i. 1. When Epiphanius and Jerome speak of him there with a degree of confidence as if it were historically certain, little value belongs to their statement. Dionysius says that Peter was at Corinth ; but though the witness was himself bishop of the place about A.D. 170, it is probable that the opinion was founded upon 1 Cor. i. 12. More importance attaches to the tradition relating to his presence at Rome.

Clement's epistle to the Corinthians speaks of Paul's martyrdom at Rome.[1] But it does not say that Peter came to Rome ; or that he died there as a martyr. Had it been known in the Roman church that Peter suffered death for the gospel's sake as well as Paul, the fact would surely have been mentioned along with the martyr-death of the latter. Its omission shows that the thing was unknown at Rome in the beginning of the second century.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, says that the two apostles planted the church at Corinth ; and suffered martyrdom in Italy about the same time.[2] This is the first statement in which Rome claims for itself the rank of an apostolic church through the fiction of a Petro-Pauline origin.

The document called ' The Preaching of Peter,'[3] of the second century, quoted as authoritative by Heracleon and Clemens Alexandrinus, represents the two apostles as being together in Rome.[4] Lactantius cites it as speaking of their preaching there together.[5]

Irenæus states that Peter and Paul preached together at Rome, and founded the church there.[6]

[1] Chapter v.
[2] Ap. Euseb. ii. 25.
[3] *κήρυγμα Πέτρου.*
[4] See Credner's *Beiträge*, p. 350.
[5] *Institut. Divin.* iv. 21.
[6] *Adv. Hæres.* iii. 1.

Tertullian alludes to Peter's death at Rome ;[1] and the presbyter Caius refers to the graves of the apostles near the city, who established the Roman church.[2] The Clementine Homilies imply that Peter died at Rome, but do not state it ; all they say is, that he was there ;[3] and Origen relates that he was crucified with his head downward.[4] Lactantius's testimony is to the same effect.[5] Eusebius says that Paul was beheaded, and Peter crucified, there.[6] The testimony of John xxi. 19 agrees with this, implying that Peter suffered death by crucifixion.

A tradition in Justin Martyr makes Simon Magus come to Rome in the reign of Claudius, where he received divine honours, and had a statue erected to him with a Latin inscription ;[7] and the Clementine Homilies assert that Peter followed to dispute with him. Eusebius states that Peter came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, A.D. 42, where he presided over the church twenty years, according to the Armenian text of his chronicle, or twenty-five according to Jerome's version.[8]

These reports rest on no proper foundation. Justin made a mistake in deciphering the Latin inscription on Simon's supposed pillar.[9] Succeeding writers adopted Eusebius's account ; and as Peter and Paul are said to have died under Nero, it was inferred that the former visited Rome twice.

Peter's first coming to Rome in Claudius's reign must be rejected, since the epistles which Paul wrote from the city show that no apostle had been there before him. If he was ever there, it could not have been before A.D. 63.

[1] *De Præscript. Hæreticorum*, c. 36.
[2] Ap. Euseb. ii. 25.
[3] See *Die Clementinen*, by Schliemann, p. 108.
[4] Ap. Euseb. iii. 1.
[5] *De Morte Persecut.* c. 2.
[6] *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 25.
[7] *Apolog.* i. c. 26.
[8] *Chronicon*, and *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 17.
[9] He read *Semoni sango* or *sanco*, Simoni sancto ; whereas *Semo sancus* or *sangus* was a Sabine deity. A pillar with the inscription in question was dug up in 1574.

Is the authority for his Roman martyrdom sufficient? We think not. Dionysius's testimony, early as it is, deserves no credit, because it contains the false assertion that Peter and Paul founded the Corinthian church; and Caius's appeal to their graves near the city is worthless. The statement of Irenæus about the two apostles *founding* the Roman church is manifestly incorrect. How then did the tradition originate? The Simon Magus legend of Ebionite origin, in which Peter is brought to Rome to vanquish the arch-heretic, or rather Paul himself described under that name, was the earliest record of his presence in the world's capital, if the Babylon of the first epistle of Peter, whence the writer dates it, be excepted. The legend runs through the Clementine literature, and its source belongs to the early part of the second century, as Lipsius shows. When the Catholic Church was being formed by the union of the Petrines and Paulines, the anti-Pauline origin of the legend was dropped out of sight, Simon was known only as the father of all heresy, and Paul was associated with Peter as his fellow-worker and fellow-sufferer in Rome. This companionship of the apostles is embodied in the *Acts of Peter and Paul*, which is cited by Clement of Alexandria as Peter's authentic production; though Origen has a different opinion. The Catholic, was probably derived from the Ebionite, tradition; though Mangold and Hilgenfeld try to show its independence.

The myth about Peter's coming to Rome in its original and anti-Pauline form must have originated soon after the Clementine epistle to the Corinthians. It appeared in its Petro-Pauline transformation about or immediately before 140 A.D. The Catholic Church naturally adopted the latter, so that it became a general belief in the last quarter of the second century. But the Ebionites still adhered to the first form of the myth, in the interest of their party. Having originated with

them, they could not easily abandon it. But it has no historical foundation either in the New Testament or in authentic tradition. That Peter was in Rome before, with, or after Paul, is a thing unheard of in the literature of the first century. The Roman letter itself which goes by the name of Clement ignores it. It was an Ebionite fiction tending to glorify the acknowledged head of the party.[1]

After Peter had been brought to Rome, his martyrdom naturally followed. Paul laid down his life for the gospel; Peter must do the same. The death of the latter is embellished with the peculiar feature that he was crucified with his head downward, at his own request, not thinking himself worthy to suffer in the same posture with his Master. The growth of tradition is illustrated by the fact, that the deaths of Paul and Peter are said to have taken place on the same day, and in the same year; though the earliest writers merely say that they suffered *about the same time.* Jerome states that they were executed on the same day; and though Augustine places a year between them, holding that they died on the same day of the month only, it came to be universally believed, after Pope Gelasius's time, that they suffered on the same day (June 29), in the same year. It was the interest of the Jewish Christians to put their leader by the side of Paul in preaching and suffering death. It was the interest of the Church at Rome in its increasing ascendancy to exalt Peter to its headship. This appears in the appendix to John's gospel, where the apostle is personally entrusted with the care of Christ's sheep (John xxi. 15–17), at a time when the title of Roman bishop carried authority and not long before Irenæus could give a continuous list of the bishops after Peter.

The basis of the tradition that Peter was at Rome

[1] See Zeller's *Die Sage von Petrus, Vorträge und Abhandlungen*, zweite Sammlung, p. 215, etc.

is weak. His presence there, instead of being a well-attested fact, can neither be proved nor made probable. It accords indeed with the Petrine Christianity of the first congregation in the city; it is in harmony with the Jewish Christian majority composing it; but these things are not bound up with the actual presence in the city.

### AUTHENTICITY.

One of the earliest testimonies to the epistle's existence is the second of Peter (iii. 1).

Polycarp knew and used it, as Eusebius relates,[1] and on comparing his epistle to the Philippians with ours, the allusions are more or less apparent. Thus in the 1st chapter: 'In whom, though ye see him not, ye believe, and believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory' (1 Peter i. 8).[2] Compare also chap. ii. with 1 Peter i. 13, 21; iii. 9; chap. v. with 1 Peter ii. 11; chap. vii. with iv. 7; chap. viii. with ii. 22–24; chap. x. with ii. 12.

Eusebius says that Papias knew the epistle.[3]

Irenæus expressly quotes it. 'And Peter says in his epistle: "Whom not seeing ye love; in whom, not seeing him now, ye have believed; ye will rejoice with unspeakable joy"' (1 Peter i. 8).[4] Elsewhere he writes: 'And on this account Peter says, that we have not freedom as a cloak of maliciousness, but for the trial and manifestation of faith' (1 Peter ii. 16).[5]

Clement of Alexandria quotes it: 'And Peter in the

[1] *H. E.* iv. 14.

[2] *εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ, κ.τ.λ.*

[3] *H. E.* iii. 39.

[4] 'Et Petrus ait in epistola sua: "Quem non videntes diligitis," inquit, "in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili."'—*Adv. Hæres.* iv. 9. 2, p. 998, ed. Migne.

[5] 'Et propter hoc Petrus ait, "Non velamentum malitiæ habere nos libertatem, sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei."'—*Ibid.* iv. 16. 5, p. 1019, ed. Migne.

epistle says the same.'[1] There are other allusions in this writer.

In like manner Tertullian refers to our epistle: 'Peter says to the people of Pontus, "How great glory is it, if when ye are punished not for your faults, ye take it patiently! For this is acceptable, and even hereunto ye were called,"' etc. (1 Peter ii. 20, 21).[2] Again: 'Peter had said that the king should be honoured' (ii. 13).[3]

According to Eusebius, Origen called it 'an acknowledged epistle.'[4] The latter quotes it often. Thus on Psalm iii.: 'As Peter says in his catholic epistle, "Whereby he went and preached,"' etc. (1 Peter iii. 19).[5] Again: 'And concerning the journey in spirit to prison in Peter's catholic epistle, "Being put to death," says he, "in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit."'[6] Mayerhoff gives other passages in which Origen quotes the epistle. Eusebius puts it among the 'acknowledged' epistles; and it was in the Peshito or old Syriac version as well as in the old Latin. According to Tjeenk-Willink, Justin Martyr used the epistle, but this is not certain.

The letter of the church at Vienne and Lyons uses its language, but does not mention the writer: 'They humbled themselves under the mighty hand by which they are now highly exalted' (1 Peter v. 6).[7] The epistle

[1] *καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τὰ ὅμοια λέγει.—Stromata*, iii. p. 562, ed. Potter.

[2] 'Petrus quidem ad Ponticos: Quanta enim, inquit, gloria, si non ut delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis! Hæc enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis,' etc.—*Scorpiac.* c. xii.

[3] 'Condixerat scilicet Petrus, regem quidem honorandum.—*Ibid.* c. 14.

[4] *ἐπιστολὴ ὁμολογουμένη.—Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25.

[5] *κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἐν ᾧ δὲ τοῖς, κ.τ.λ.—Opp.* vol. ii. p. 553, ed. Benedict.

[6] *καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορείας μετὰ πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ· Θανατωθεὶς γάρ, φησί, ζωοποιηθείς, κ.τ.λ.—Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 135.

[7] *ἐταπείνουν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιαν χείρα, ὑφ' ἧς ἱκανῶς νῦν εἰσιν ὑψωμένοι.*—Ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v. 2.

to Diognetus applies the phrase to God, that He gave 'the just for the unjust' (1 Peter iii. 18).[1]

On the other hand, it is absent from the Muratorian canon, a fact which some critics have tried to supplement or explain away by altering the existing text more or less arbitrarily. It was rejected by the Paulicians, according to Petrus Siculus: 'They do not admit the two catholic epistles of Peter chief of the apostles, being ill-affected towards him.'[2]

According to Leontius of Byzantium, Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the epistle.[3]

It was also rejected with the other catholic epistles, by Cosmas Indicopleustes.

The authenticity of the epistle is well attested by external testimonies both ancient and numerous.

Let us consider the internal evidence.

The author was acquainted with several of Paul's epistles; their ideas as well as expressions being in the work before us. Reminiscences of that to the Romans are most apparent.

| 1 PETER. | |
|---|---|
| Not *fashioning yourselves* according to the former *lusts* in your ignorance (i. 14). | And *be not conformed* to this world (Rom. xii. 2). |
| Who by him do believe in God, that *raised him up from the dead* (i. 21). | If we believe in him that *raised up Jesus our* Lord *from the dead* (Rom. iv. 24). |
| To offer up spiritual sacrifices, *acceptable to God*, etc. (ii. 1, 2, 5). | That ye present your bodies a *living sacrifice*, holy, *acceptable unto God*, which is your reasonable service (Rom. xii. 1). |
| Behold, *I lay in Sion* a chief corner stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious, but unto them which be disobe- | Behold, *I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offence*, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed (Rom. ix. 33). |

[1] Bunsen's *Analecta ante-Nicæna*, vol. i. p. 116.

[2] See Wetstein's *N. Test.* vol. ii. p. 681.

[3] *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos, in Canisii Thesauro Monumentor. Eccles. et Hist.* vol. i. p. 577, ed. Antwerp, 1725.

dient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and *a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence* (ii. 6, 7).

Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy (ii. 10).

*Submit yourselves* to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as *supreme*; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for *the punishment* of evil doers, and for the *praise* of them that do well (ii. 13).

As free, and not using your *liberty* as a cloak of maliciousness (ii. 16).

That we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness (ii. 24).

Not rendering *evil for evil* (iii. 9).

As every man hath received *the gift*, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold *grace* of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man *minister*, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth (iv. 10 11).

And also a partaker of *the glory that shall be revealed* (v. 1).

That the trial of your faith being much more precious than of gold which perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and *honour and glory* at the appearing of Jesus Christ (i. 7).

Rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed ye

As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God (Rom. ix. 25, 26).

Let every soul *be subject unto the higher powers*. For there is no power but of God. . . . Do that which is good, and thou shalt have *praise* of the same. . . for he is the minister of God, a *revenger to execute wrath* upon him that doeth evil (Rom. xiii. 1-4).

For, brethren, ye have been called unto *liberty*; only use not *liberty* for an occasion to the flesh (Gal. v. 13).

Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness (Rom. vi. 18).

Recompense to no man *evil for evil* (Rom. xii. 17).

Having then *gifts* differing according to *the grace* that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or *ministry*, let us wait on our ministering, etc. (Rom. xii. 6, 7).

With *the glory that shall be revealed* in us (Rom. viii. 18).

To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for *glory and honour* and immortality, eternal life, *Glory, honour*, and peace to every man that worketh good (Romans ii. 7, 10).

And if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that

| 1 PETER. | |
|---|---|
| may be glad also with exceeding joy (iv. 13). | we may be also glorified together (Romans viii. 17). |
| Use hospitality one to another without grudging (iv. 9). | Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality (Rom. xii. 13). |
| For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in *lasciviousness*, lusts, excess of wine, *revellings*, banquetings and abominable idolatries (iv. 3). | Let us walk honestly as in the day; not in *rioting* and drunkenness, not in chambering and *wantonness*, not in strife and envying (Romans xiii. 13). |
| Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin (iv. 1).[1] | Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof (Romans xiii. 14). |
| *Be sober, be vigilant* (v. 8). | *Let us watch and be sober* (1 Thess. v. 6). |
| Greet ye one another *with a kiss of charity* (v. 14). | Greet ye one another *with an holy kiss* (1 Cor. xvi. 20). |

No critical result is clearer than the dependence of the epistle on that to the Romans, which is so obvious in relation to the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of the latter, that the later writer is only a copyist of the other. The position has been thoroughly established by Holtzmann and Seufert.[2]

The doctrine of the epistle is essentially Pauline. The author speaks of *election* and *foreknowledge* (i. 2; ii. 9); of *recompence* at the appearing of Jesus Christ, expressed by the word *praise* (i. 7), as in 1 Cor. iv. 5; of *participation* in the sufferings of Christ (iv. 13), as in Phil. iii. 10; compare 2 Cor. i. 5; of an *inheritance* (i. 4), as in Gal. iii. 18; of the abuse of *liberty* (ii. 16), as in Gal. v. 13; of divine *calling* (i. 15), which is a characteristic Pauline doctrine; of moral obedience (i. 2, 14), as in Rom. vi. 16; xvi. 19; and instead of the 'obedience of faith' (Rom. i. 5), Peter has the 'obedience of truth,' taken from the former. The word

[1] Comp. Holtzmann, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, vol. iv. pp. 496, 497.

[2] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 360, etc.

rendered *hidden* [1] is a Pauline one, to which *man* is appended, taken from Rom. ii. 16. Instead of 'the hidden things of the heart' (1 Cor. xiv. 25), Peter has the 'hidden man of the heart' (iii. 4). The phrase *in Christ* (iii. 16; v. 10, 14) is also Pauline. The *revelation* of Jesus Christ referring to his second coming (i. 7, 13; iv. 13) is from 1 Cor. i. 7. The consequence of sin being taken away by the death of Christ is Pauline, though not expressed in the same words, 'to die to sin, and live to righteousness' (1 Peter ii. 24). Paul has *to live to God.*[2]

The general result to which these coincidences lead is, that the writer had read the epistle to the Romans and others, whose ideas and phraseology became incorporated with his religious consciousness. Pauline views of doctrine and duty formed and moulded his conceptions of Christianity; while the phraseology in which they were clothed was partially accepted. The coincidences are too striking to be denied, as in the case of iii. 8, etc. compared with Rom. xii. 10, etc., where the same virtues are enjoined. The order in which they are enumerated is different, but they are the same. Equally convincing is the similarity of ii. 13, etc. to Rom. xiii. 1–4, where the same motive for subjection to the ruling powers appears. Even in a quotation from the Old Testament the agreement is remarkable. The citation in ii. 6, 7, and Rom. ix. 33, departs in both instances from the Septuagint and Hebrew. *In him* is added in 1 Peter ii. 6 and Rom. ix. 33; and Isai. xxviii. 16 is not the only source used, but also viii. 14; the words *stone of stumbling, and rock of offence*, which are identical in the two epistles, being derived from the latter passage and not in the Septuagint form.

Was Peter then a Pauline Christian? Was he

[1] κρυπτός.

[2] See the Greek table in De Wette's *Einleitung*. The words in italics are the same in the original.

dependent on Paul for leading ideas, formulas, and expressions ? Had he so little originality as to necessitate recourse to reminiscences of written epistles ? Early Christian literature is against the belief that Peter was aught else than a Jewish Christian, who retained the primitive or Ebionite doctrine. All that we know of him negatives the idea that he developed into an enlarged believer of the Pauline stamp. The early converts who appealed to him as their head set his authority against and above Paul's, considering the two apostles as antagonistic. This is shown not only by the canonical epistles of Paul, but more definitely by the Clementine Homilies. It is therefore improbable that Peter's sentiments became Pauline, as the epistle presents them ; or that he possessed so little originality as to borrow largely from other writers.

Some critics try to account for all Pauline similarities of thought and diction in the epistle of Peter without the use, direct or indirect, of prior epistles. Of these the most painstaking is Brückner,[1] who treads closely in the steps of Mayerhoff But the effort is futile, since the advocates of the Petrine dependence neither represent it as absolute, nor deny diversity by the side of similarity. The coincidences are not of the nature of verbal transcription, but are reminiscences. Hence ideas and phrases borrowed from Paul may be and are sometimes put in a different connection or receive a different application. Besides, the author of the epistle, though imbued with Paulinism, was not without some independence or originality. He has features of his own, though they are not of a high order like Paul's—features consisting in his practical mode of presenting the Pauline system divested of its angular projections and apparent hardness. Paulinism is modified and softened. There are even some devia-

[1] In the third edition of De Wette's *Erklärung der Briefe des Petrus, Judas und Jacobus*, 1865.

tions from it ; or changes of view which point to a stage of development beyond the Pauline. The basis of the author's system is undoubtedly Pauline—for Judaism is represented as a thing of the past, and the Christian church a new kingdom, a divine institution, founded on faith in the redemptive death of Christ—but other aspects of Christianity are given which Paul does not express.

Brückner makes great use of a general Christian consciousness as the source of Petrine ideas and expressions, so that they may not be considered Pauline. Without denying the existence and influence of that common possession, we question the effect attributed to it, because Peter and Paul represented two sides of primitive Christianity, to which a common Christian consciousness belonged but partially. The Ebionism of the one, and the universalism of the other, were not fused together while the two apostles lived ; though an approach had been made towards the absorption of the former in the latter. The influence of a general Christian consciousness was not far-reaching enough to become the fountain of the Pauline ideas in our epistle, at least in Peter's lifetime.

The argument against authenticity founded on the dependence of Peter on Paul, is strengthened by the fact that James's letter has been used. The resemblances of certain passages in 1 Peter to others in the so-called epistle of James, are pretty obvious. The following are worthy of notice.

| JAMES. | 1 PETER. |
| --- | --- |
| My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into diverse temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience (i. 2, 3). | Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, etc. etc., might be found unto praise etc. (i. 6, 7). |
| Because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away. For the sun is no sooner risen with a burn- | For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and |

| JAMES. | 1 PETER. |
| --- | --- |
| ing heat, but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof falleth (i. 10, 11). | the flower thereof falleth away (i. 24). |
| Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, etc. (i. 18). | Being born again . . . . by the word of God, etc. (i. 23). |
| Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble . . . . Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up (iv. 6, 10). | For God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you (v. 5, 6). |
| He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins (v. 20).[1] | For charity shall cover the multitude of sins (iv. 8). |

In these places there is not only a similarity of ideas, but of language. It is true that two of the passages are taken from the Proverbs, but it is unlikely that the coincidence was accidental, because the same conclusion is drawn from the citation in both, at least in James iv. 6 and 1 Peter v. 5. The similarity is so striking, that though it is possible to account for it without assuming that the one writer read the other's production, it is unlikely. In like manner, when Peter writes to the *strangers scattered* throughout Pontus, etc., that is, to Gentiles sojourning in the specified countries, he borrows the expressions of James i. 1, where *the twelve tribes scattered abroad* are addressed. In the latter place, the phraseology is appropriate, 'the twelve tribes which are in the dispersion;' in the former it is hardly so, because the word *dispersion* (elect sojourners *of the dispersion*) is seemingly transferred from the twelve tribes to the Gentiles. The epistle of James preceded that of Peter, as far as we can judge from the coincidence.

This dependence of the epistle upon James must not be reversed, as it is by Bengel, Grimm, Blom, and W. Brückner; for it is pretty clear that the Peter who

[1] See the Greek table in Hug's *Einleitung*, vol. ii. p. 466, 4th ed.

writes here is dependent on James. This is another peculiarity which detracts from Peter's supposed authorship. When his independence is encroached upon to a certain extent, he must be withdrawn from his traditional position.

To neutralise the objection taken from Peter's dependence on Paul and James, agreement between Peter and John is adduced. *Being born again of incorruptible seed* (i. 23) is like *being born of God*, whose *seed remaineth in* the believer (1 John iii. 9) ; the word *purify* is the same in i. 22, and 1 John iii. 3 ; *to live to righteousness* (ii. 24) rests on the same conception of righteousness as *doing righteousness* (1 John iii. 7) ; *followers of that which is good* (iii. 13) recurs in 3 John 11, connected with the doing of good ; the Christian church compared to a flock (v. 2) reminds one of John x. 16 ; xxi. 16 ; Christ is *the just* in iii. 18, and 1 John iii. 7 ; Christ is called *a lamb* in i. 19 and John i. 29. These resemblances appear to be no more than accidental, and are very different from the Pauline ones. It is therefore illogical to infer that the Pauline similarities prove nothing more than they, viz. Peter's independent authorship.

Although the writings of John were not known to the author of our epistle, there is some affinity of ideas between them. The latter speaks strongly against Judaism (ii. 7, etc.), just as John does (vi. 41–43 ; 60, etc. ; ix. 39, etc. ; xii. 37, etc.). Patience and steadfastness in the midst of suffering are repeatedly inculcated, with reference to the example of Christ (i. 6 ; ii. 19, 20 ; iii. 14, 17 ; iv. 1–12), etc. So in John xv. 18, etc. ; xvi. 1, etc. ; 1 John iii. 13. He loves to refer to Isaiah, who announced beforehand the lamb of God (i. 19 ; ii. 4, 6, 9, 22, etc.), as John does, i. 23, 27 ; xii. 37. The Spirit of Christ dwelt in the prophets, enabling them to testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow ; which agrees with

John's saying that Esaias saw Christ's glory, and spake of him (xii. 41). In consequence of this approach to the characteristic spirit of John's writings, we must suppose that Paulinism was progressing towards its ultimate expression in the Johannine circle of ideas when our author wrote. This is confirmed by its relationship to the epistle to the Hebrews, which is more apparent than any likeness it bears to John. The writer views Christianity as the complement of Judaism, Jerusalem being considered the centre of God's kingdom, and the gentiles in that kingdom outside the metropolis being 'the dispersion.' Like the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, Peter is disposed to find types in the Old Testament of things of the New, as in iii. 20, etc. Compare Hebr. xi. 7. The dignity of Christians is set forth in ancient formulas (ii. 5, 9, 10; iv. 14). The death of Christ in connection with the bearing of sin, is described in a manner nearer to that of the epistle to the Hebrews and John's gospel, than to Paul. Compare ii. 24 with Hebr. ix. 28—i. 2 with Hebr. xii. 24; ix. 14; x. 22—iii. 18 with Hebr. ix. 26–28—iii. 21 with Hebr. ix. 24 and x. 19; ii. 11 with xi. 13. Christ is said to have appeared 'in these last times' (i. 20), as in Hebr. i. 2. Thus the author was probably acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews, and if that were so, we are carried beyond the lifetime of the apostle to a period when Alexandrian ideas were beginning to influence men's conceptions of Christianity in Palestine; and Paulinism itself was passing on to its ultimate development in the Johannine type. The writer hardly stands *midway* between Paul and John, for the objective prevails over the subjective; but he is between them in time, if not in characteristics.

A thorough comparison of the present epistle with those of Paul, James, and John, instead of furnishing a remarkable attestation to the one mind which per-

vades all Scripture as some allege, or to the one Spirit using the different faculties of men according to his will, is detrimental to the spiritual independence of the writers. We are unable to see with Holtzmann echoes of the Colossian epistle in the present one. The corresponding passages, which he gives, are a precarious support to the opinion.

As an offset to the epistle's dependence on Paul and James, its peculiarities have been carefully collected; and those who think that the writer was a Paulinist need not deny them. Some things are certainly peculiar; such as the idea of angels desiring to look with curious gaze into the salvation effected by Christ (i. 10–12); Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison (iii. 19, 20); the typification of baptism by the flood, and its being called 'the answer of a good conscience' (iii. 21); Christ's designation as the chief shepherd (v. 4); the grounding of an exhortation to good conduct in the fact of unbelievers acknowledging through it the causelessness of their reproaches (ii. 13; iii. 16); the endurance of wrong being termed a *grace* before God (ii. 20); the presentation of Christ's sufferings as an example of sufferings for the faith (ii. 21, etc.), and of the sufferings of believers as the beginning of judgment (iv. 12); the referring of women to the example of Sarah's subjection to Abraham (iii. 6); and the consolation derived from the similarity of the sufferings endured by Christian brethren (v. 9). The culminating point of Christianity is hope—a well-grounded expectation of future glory.

These peculiarities are secondary, not prominent or fundamental things. Some of them are exaggerated by Mayerhoff and Weiss, especially *hope*, so that they call Peter 'the apostle of hope,' as if that attitude of mind was not a part of the common Christian consciousness in early times. If hope were an original feature of the epistle, its central idea and subject, it would stand

in closer relation to the second coming of Christ; whereas it assumes no special connection with that event.

The epistle bears evidence of a mediating or conciliatory standpoint. Specific anti-Jewish Paulinism does not appear. Justification by faith alone is not mentioned. The sharp points of antagonism between the Petrines and Paulines give place to a mild statement in which the Ebionitic James is used along with the liberal Paul; and the latter's assistant Silvanus is commended by the side of Mark, Peter's traditional helper. Polemic zeal is absent; and no particular doctrine is emphasised. The production shows little originality, because it has no large views of the world, no important development of individual doctrines. Its originality consists in the judicious condensation of sentiments already current; the combination of existing materials into a fresh shape. As a popular epistle, it has much excellence; and the collection of Christian writings would be imperfect without it. Köstlin's epithet applied to the writer is pretty near the truth, an *eclectic*, whose free elaboration of current ideas and writings resulted in a peculiar letter.

The conclusion just stated is not weakened by an argument adduced for the authenticity, from the resemblance of ideas and expressions in the epistle to Peter's speeches in the Acts: the allusion to the crucifixion and the use of the word *tree* in Acts v. 30; x. 39; 1 Peter ii. 24; the peculiar application of the term *witness* in Acts ii. 32; iii. 15; 1 Peter v. 1; the connection of the old prophets with the work of Christ in Acts iii. 18; x. 43; 1 Peter i. 10; the phrase, 'judge quick and dead' in Acts x. 42; 1 Peter iv. 51. The clauses, *the faith which is by him*, *the faithful* or *believers by him* in Acts iii. 16; 1 Peter i. 21, are also specified as cognates. This argument would be more plausible, if the speeches of Peter in the Acts were

verbally repeated. But they are not. Their sentiments and language are conformed to Paul's. The writer of the Acts has freely shaped them. Hence the alleged similarity in doctrine, facts, and style, between this epistle and Peter's speeches in the Acts, is of no account. Slight as it is at the best, apologists magnify it into a remarkable coincidence. From what has been advanced it appears that no Petrine system of doctrine is deducible from our epistle, even though it be taken in connection with other literature in which the chief apostle had a part. Weiss's *Petrinischer Lehrbegriff* is built of crumbling materials. It is possible that the letter may contain a pre-Pauline development of apostolic doctrine ; but the idea is not warranted by internal evidence.

It is improbable that Peter should write to the churches of Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, which Paul had founded and instructed ; at least while the apostle himself was alive. If he were in Babylon on the Euphrates, as many think, he could know very little of their state. It is assumed indeed that Mark had gone from Asia Minor to Babylon, and told him about the condition of the Christians in the countries referred to ; but that is conjecture. Nor is the difficulty removed by supposing, with Brückner, that Mark had been with Peter before he went back to Paul, after the separation referred to in Acts xv. 39 ; a supposition altogether gratuitous. The salutation makes no mention of Mark's late presence in Asia Minor ; nor does the epistle allude to the writer's information respecting the churches being received through Mark. On the contrary, the expression, 'Marcus, my son,' looks as if the churches knew little about Peter's companion. If Paul was a prisoner in Rome when Peter wrote to these Christians, it is strange that he should never allude to that fact ; though it was one which would excite their sympathy. And if the apostle of the Gen-

tiles was still travelling about, why should the apostle of the circumcision write to communities consisting for the most part of Gentiles? As soon as we try to get an intelligible or consistent view of Peter writing to these Pauline churches from Babylon while Mark was with him, either immediately before Paul's imprisonment or after it, the field of historical probability must be abandoned.

It is not likely that Peter knew Greek so well as to be able to write the epistle. His native dialect was Aramæan, which he would not lay aside as long as he addressed the Jewish Christians of Palestine. If he ever went to Babylon, it was on account of the Hebrew Christians there, who spoke the same language. Hence it is not surprising, that several critics suppose that the epistle did not proceed from the apostle in its present form, but that it was translated out of Aramæan by Silvanus or Mark. Jerome speaks of Peter using 'different interpreters' in the two epistles, because of their different style. The expression, 'I have written by Silvanus' (v. 12), might even be applied to Peter's dictation of the letter to Silvanus his amanuensis; but had he been the translator, we should have expected a salutation from him. The epistle bears no marks of a version; and in the absence of opposite testimony, we hold that it was written in Greek. Hence Peter's authorship becomes improbable, as he used the Aramæan tongue.

A new doctrine appears in iii. 18, etc. and iv. 6, where it is said that the gospel was preached to the dead. It was Christ who preached to the captive spirits in the lower world, to the sinners who perished in the time of Noah. His redeeming power is extended to all. This is the first mention of Christ's descent into Hades. And the dead who are supposed to be saved through it are represented as having had their judgment in the death of the body, for they are still alive as incorporeal

spirits. The idea that salvation is offered even to those in the lower world, is a beautiful one. The gospel message is presented to all, even to such as had died impenitent. Its range is universal. This conception is post-Pauline. It is not perhaps entirely original, for the Jews make such Israelites as are in Sheol partakers of Messiah's benefits.[1] Justin Martyr and Irenæus cite a passage from Jeremiah about the Holy One of Israel descending to the dead to evangelise them; but it is not in the writings of the prophet, and is probably of Jewish Christian, not Jewish, origin. The present writer may have also had respect to the *subterranean* beings or things spoken of in the Philippian epistle (ii. 10). In any case, the thought of Christ being the Saviour of all, so that even the dead deserve deliverance, commends itself to the spiritual consciousness of humanity. A somewhat similar text about the under world occurs in Hermas; but instead of Christ descending to preach to the spirits, *the apostles* go down to give baptism to the righteous—an idea unknown to the fathers, except to Clement of Alexandria who copied Hermas.[2]

In modern times, Semler was the first that doubted Peter's direct authorship of the epistle, and Eichhorn followed. A similar position is assumed by Ewald, Grimm, and Renan; the last scholar giving Peter the help of Silvanus. Such mediating process carries improbability on the face of it. The work is either Peter's entirely, or it is not; and Weiss is consistent in asserting the Petrine authorship, boldly maintaining that Paul used the epistle, instead of Peter using Paul's writings. It was an easy task for Seufert to refute this hypothesis. Since Schwegler and Baur, who first set aside the Petrine claims with critical skill, other scholars have accepted their conclusion: Zeller, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Blom and W. Brückner. The

[1] See Bertholdt's *Christologia Judæorum*, etc. p. 173, etc.

[2] See Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 16. 5.

Petrine origin of the letter is generally abandoned by scholars.

### TIME AND PLACE.

The place of writing was Rome, the mystical Babylon whence Peter is supposed to address scattered believers. Babylon on the Euphrates would naturally be understood as the locality of the writer, if he were Peter; but it is unlikely that he ever was there. Ecclesiastical history is silent respecting his sojourn in Babylonia. On the other hand, the testimony of antiquity is favourable to Rome. Papias and Clement of Alexandria understood Babylon to be that city. After the naming of Rome as Babylon in the Apocalypse, the figurative usage became common. It is in the Sibylline oracles and Hippolytus; in Eusebius and Jerome. The objection that a mystical appellation is unsuitable to an epistle, is of no weight. An author personating Peter might well use a metaphorical appellation for the supposed place of his abode.

A Roman Christian wrote the epistle, in the name of Peter.

Indications of date have been found in the contents. Some, as Mayerhoff and Neander, suppose that the Neronian persecution had begun; an opinion that brings the composition of the epistle immediately after July 19, A.D. 64. Others think that the persecution was only apprehended; and date the letter earlier. The decision depends on the interpretation of various passages: i. 6; ii. 12; iii. 13–17; iv. 12–19; v. 6–10; especially on iii. 15, 16; iv. 4, 5, 16–19; v. 9. The Christians were branded as *evil-doers*, called upon to answer accusations directed against them, and condemned to death. The very name of *christian* was a crime. The exhortation to obey all rulers appears to imply that the Roman authorities had instituted legal proceedings

against the Christians; which agrees with the time of Trajan, who was the first emperor that ordered a proper investigation of the accusations brought against Christians in the Roman empire, and enacted that the persistent confession of the new religion should be punished with death. It is significant that the writer addresses believers in Bithynia; since Pliny was the governor, and had written for instructions to Rome as to the way of dealing with the Christians there. The reign of Trajan also agrees with *the strangeness* of the new trial and with *the espionage* practised, against which this emperor passed strict laws (iv. 12, 15). The Neronian persecution did not extend to the whole empire. Hence the situation indicated in the epistle does not comport with that time, but was one of general suffering and fiery trial to which the Christians throughout the provinces were exposed from the judicial measures taken against them by the governors. The passages we have referred to are unsuited to the Neronian persecution, because it arose out of a specific charge against the Christians in Rome, viz. that they were incendiaries; whereas the persons addressed in the epistle were branded as *evil-doers* generally; the fact of their being *Christians* and living differently from the Gentiles around them exciting suspicion and ill-will. They were proceeded against as murderers, thieves, informers. The spread of persecution and the general attention which the conduct of Christians in Asia, so unlike that of the self-indulgent heathen among whom they lived, had excited, carry us farther than the reign of Nero, even to that of Trajan. Their sufferings had begun, and more grievous ones were feared; but the writer expects their speedy cessation. Had the language of the epistle been more definite, intimating a systematic persecution of the believers for a specific crime, like that of incendiarism, it might have suited the Neronian period from A.D. 64; but it points to another time and a wider field,

when Christianity had drawn away so many converts in the Roman provinces of Asia that the magistrates were obliged to take measures against it. All the circumstances bring us to the reign of Trajan, perhaps to the year A.D. 113. So Schwegler[1] and Baur conclude; and their opinion is most probable.

### PERSONS ADDRESSED.

The letter is addressed to 'the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,' etc. The word translated *strangers*[2] is of doubtful meaning. It signifies a sojourner, one who stays for a short time in a strange place; and should be taken metaphorically. Weiss, who argues at great length, that the epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians, relies on the following words, 'scattered through Pontus,' etc., for proof that the Jewish believers in the five provinces specified were the parties intended.[3] But Gentile readers are implied in the letter itself (i. 14, 18; ii. 9, 10; iii. 6; iv. 3). Though some of these passages may appear ambiguous, because of the Jewish phraseology employed, the author's manner, which is to speak of Christianity as the consummation of Judaism, and Gentile Christians as the spiritual Israel, explains them. We know from the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's epistles, that the churches in Asia Minor mainly consisted of Gentile converts It is likely too, that those of the other four countries specified were substantially composed of Gentiles. If therefore the writer addresses Gentile churches, the word *stranger* must be taken symbolically or typically for *Gentile pilgrims* or *sojourners*, those absent from the spiritual centre of God's kingdom on earth, or the Christian Jerusalem. In this way the epithet applies to Gentile Christians, for whom

[1] *Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, vol. ii. p. 10, *et seq.*

[2] παρεπιδήμοις.

[3] *Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, p. 29.

we believe the author intended it. The spiritual idea of pilgrimage is predominant in the epithet; and the following word, *dispersion*,[1] belongs as much to the noun before as to the proper names succeeding it. The language cannot be taken literally, denoting Jews in strange lands, without contradicting the contents of the letter. Neither can the word *strangers* be restricted, with Credner, to proselytes, those of Gentile extraction who had embraced Judaism before turning to Christianity, for proselytes were otherwise styled.[2] That there were some Jews and some proselytes in these communities is probable enough; but they were the smaller number. The Pauline churches were chiefly Gentile.

### OBJECT.

At the close of the letter the author says, 'By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand,' intimating that his design was to assure them of the truth they had received from the lips of Paul and his fellow-workers being the unchangeable word of God, the source of animating hope and permanent comfort, which they should appropriate with the simplicity of new-born babes, that they might grow to Christian maturity. Thus he intended to confirm them in the faith which Paul taught. It was also included in his design to exhort them to steadfastness under the trials to which they were exposed, to give consolation, and to regulate their conduct towards the heathen around; that they might be sober, holy, harmless, silencing their persecutors with well-doing. The greater part of the letter has to do with the latter aspect of the design; from which we infer that the relation they bore to the

[1] διασπορά. [2] προσήλυτοι, εὐλαβεῖς, φοβούμενοι.

heathens was a critical one. Suspicion, jealousy, and oppression from those without, fell to the lot of these Christians. In such circumstances the writer counselled them about their conduct, and the way in which they should meet the hatred of enemies. As they had been already grounded in the doctrines of Christianity, the letter is not doctrinal. Neither does it enter into the peculiarities of their inner life or experience. Perhaps the author did not know them well enough to do that. He contents himself with general admonitions to steadfastness. The relations of the author to his readers are not definite. Credner,[1] indeed, appeals to i. 1, 23, 25; ii. 11; v. 1, 12, 13, as proof that the Christians addressed had an accurate acquaintance with the writer and his affairs; but the passages in question do not reveal the fact; much less do they imply that he had laboured in the gospel for their benefit and in their midst. They show that he took an interest in their welfare, and that he knew their general condition, with the trials they were exposed to; but there are no traces of personal work among them; nothing definite in their circumstances prompting him to write. The picture is drawn in broad outlines; just as the individuality of the author himself is indistinct. He confines himself to generals, so that his production has little of a personal character.

### GENERAL CHARACTER, STYLE, AND DICTION.

Steiger[2] finds in the epistle great facility of expression and ease in linking ideas together; but the case does not appear to us in the same light. The language is somewhat rugged, and the author's control over it incomplete. He uses it with a degree of embarrassment,

[1] *Einleitung*, p. 640.

[2] *Exposition of the First Epistle of Peter*, etc, vol. i. pp. 7, 8, English translation.

which influences the development of his ideas and makes their consecution illogical. They are often attached to a word by means of a relative pronoun, which gives the style a limping appearance. The sequence of ideas, such as it is, has been well traced by Seyler in the first twelve verses, where it is least apparent;[1] and it is observable in the remainder of the epistle.

The diction is not devoid of strength, but it is rough; and the construction is often constrained. The author repeats the same sentiments, in identical or similar words, oftener than Paul. Compare, for example, iii. 16 with ii. 12; iii. 1—iv. 3 with i. 14; ii. 11—iv. 12 with i. 6–9; iv. 14 with ii. 20; iii. 14, 17; v. 8 with iv. 7; i. 13. He likes to employ the preposition *to* with the accusative of a person (i. 4, 10, 11, 25); to separate the article from its noun (iii. 2, 3, 16); to use the particle *as* (i. 14, 19; ii. 2, 5, 11–14, 16, 25; iii. 6, 7; iv. 10–12, 15, 16; v. 3, 8, 12); and to apply a participle, not only with an imperative either before or after it, but absolutely, without any finite verb (i. 13, 14, 18, 22, 23; ii. 1, 4, 12, 16, 18; iii. 1, 7, 9, 16; iv. 8; v. 7). In no other writer do we meet with *glories* (i. 11), or *virtues* in the plural number (ii. 9); and with *the same sufferings* (v. 9)[2] so expressed. In citing the Old Testament the phrase *it is contained in Scripture* (ii. 6)[3] is singular. *The Spirit of God rests* (iv. 14); *the loins of the mind* (i. 13); *to distribute honour* (iii. 7), are also phrases peculiar to the writer. He has favourite words;[4] and the number of terms which occur in his epistle alone is large.[5]

[1] *Studien und Kritiken* for 1832, p. 44, *et seq.*

[2] τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων.

[3] περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ.

[4] As ἀναστροφή, κακοποιός.

[5] So called ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, as ἀδελφότης, ἄδολος, ἀναγεννᾶν, αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, ἀμαράντινος, ἀμάραντος, ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀναζώννυσθαι, ἀνάχυσις, ἀνεκλάλητος, ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, ἀντιλοιδορεῖν, ἀπογίνεσθαι, ἀπονέμειν, ἀρτιγέννητος, ἀπροσωπολήπτως, ἀρχιποίμην, ἀθέμιτος, βιοῦν, βασίλειος, γυναικεῖος, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν, ἐπερώτημα, ἐμπλοκή, ἔνδυσις, ἔννοια sing., ἐξαγγέλλειν, ἐποπτύειν, ἐπικάλυμμα, ἐπίλοιπος, ἐγκομβοῦσθαι, ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἐξερευνᾶν, ἱερά-

It is not uncommon to trace Peter's mental idiosyncrasy in the manner, style, and language of the letter, after it has been assumed that he wrote it. Fervour has been pronounced its chief characteristic, from Chrysostom downward. The author hurries on, says what he has to say in any words that come soonest, stamps the image of his soul on thoughts and language, portrays the profound emotions that swayed him, his earnest convictions and thorough zeal. Such description is the offspring of imagination. The writer is calm, serene, zealous but mild, earnest but not fervid. He does not hurry along. Instead of stamping the image of his soul upon the letter, it is obvious that he lacked the profundity of emotion and intensity of purpose which alone could impart a living impress to the production. The very trait most absent from the letter is a distinct individuality. We admit that tokens of individual character and independence are found here and there, but they are of a minor kind, having their basis in Paulinism and consisting of details. The body of Christian doctrine on which he builds is Paul's, interpenetrated with his own remarks ; the practical side of it being presented after his own fashion. To speak therefore of 'a Petrine doctrinal system,'[1] or to find one in the epistle, is preposterous. The author's manner is fresh but passionless, more placid and chastened than we might expect from Peter. He is cheerful, consolatory, and hopeful. We do not say that Peter could not have written the letter, for it is hazardous to judge of one's composition and pronounce it authentic or not from a few personal traits ; but the absence of definite personality, and its mild tone, make his authorship improbable. The fiery vigour of the

*τευμα, κλέος, κραταιός, ὁμόφρων, ὁπλίζεσθαι, οἰνοφλυγία, πτόησις, προμαρτύρεσθαι, περίθεσις, πότος, πατροπαράδοτος, προθύμως, ῥύπος, συνοικεῖν, συνεκλεκτή, συμπαθής, σθενοῦν, σπορά, συμπρεσβύτερος, ὑπολιμπάνειν, ὑπογραμμός, φιλάδελφος, ὠρύεσθαι*, nearly sixty in all.

[1] *Petrinischer Lehrbegriff*, the title of a volume by B. Weiss.

apostle is not reflected. The head of the Jewish Christians must have greatly changed, if he became the conciliatory expounder of a practical Paulinism.

## ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

Steiger states truly that a logically-arranged table of all the contents can scarcely be given. The author passes from one thing to another, insensibly. A sequence of ideas can be traced though it is irregular.

Perhaps the best division is into two parts, exclusive of the salutation, introduction, and concluding verses, the former containing general, the latter particular exhortations, viz. i. 13–ii. 10, and ii. 11–v. 11.

The inscription and salutation are in verses 1, 2.

In the introduction the author expresses gratitude to God for the abundant blessings of salvation bestowed on himself and his readers, reminding them of the conflict which Christians have to endure; and taking it for granted that they were conducting themselves so that it should issue in complete salvation in the day of Christ's manifestation. The mention of salvation leads him to mark its importance by the fact, that the old prophets were earnestly desirous to know the time to which the spirit of prophecy respecting Christ pointed; and that the angels themselves were eager to look into it (i. 3–12).

A series of general admonitions follows. He exhorts the Christians of Asia Minor to a watchful and perfect hope in the favour to be brought to them at the future appearance of Christ; to obedience and holiness, since he that called them is holy, and because they should fear their judge, recollecting the atoning death of Christ, who was foreordained from eternity but appeared in the latter time for the benefit of believers. He counsels them still further to holiness and especially to brotherly love, by bringing to their recollection the

regenerated state into which they were introduced by the instrumentality of the living word, which he proves to abide for ever by reference to the Old Testament (i. 13–25).

The writer further exhorts them to growth in the new life, if indeed they had begun to experience the grace of God, reminding them that they formed part of the spiritual temple of which Jesus Christ is the corner-stone; and that they were the officiating priests in it to offer spiritual sacrifices. This is established by an appeal to the Old Testament; whence he draws the conclusion that the honour is to believers, while danger and destruction await the disobedient. Resuming the description of Christians contained in a preceding verse, he represents them as a peculiar people who had obtained mercy (ii. 1–10).

The second division consists of a series of special exhortations, bearing on the external and internal relations of those addressed (ii. 11–v. 11).

The author counsels his readers to maintain a good life among the heathen, that their adversaries might be led to glorify God, and submit to the civil government they were under; for though spiritually free, they should not abuse their liberty. On the contrary, they were bound to treat all with due respect (ii. 12–17).

Slaves are enjoined to obey their masters, and to be patient under the ills of their lot, since they were called for this very purpose that they should exhibit a spirit of meek endurance under the pressure of suffering, in accordance with the example of Christ who bore the penalty for our sins and brought us back to his fold (ii. 18–25).

Wives are exhorted to obey their husbands; and instead of priding themselves on outward decorations, to attract by mental charms. This is enforced by the examples of holy women under the old dispensation and of Sarah in particular, whose daughters Gentile

women become when they do right, and have no fear of threatenings without (iii. 1–6).

Husbands are admonished to honour and respect the wife as the weaker vessel (iii. 7).

By way of conclusion, the author subjoins a general exhortation respecting unanimity, sympathy, brotherly love, mercifulness, courtesy, returning good for evil, speaking peace instead of speaking guile; reminding his readers that God rewards the good and punishes the evil (iii. 8–12).

He now exhorts them to the exercise of a fearless, meek, and patient spirit in the prospect of suffering, founded on the possession of a good conscience; referring for their encouragement to the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, who, when put to death in the body, lived in spirit and preached in Hades to the captive spirits who had been disobedient till the flood. In like manner through baptism, in a mode similar to that in which Noah and his family were rescued, a small number are now saved by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, who is gone to the right hand of God (iii. 13–22).

This leads to encouraging counsel. Since Christ suffered for sinners, they should exhibit the fortitude and patience He displayed; for the man who bears his sufferings with a Christian spirit ceases to sin habitually, that he may live after the will of God. Believers should not indulge fleshly lusts after the manner of the heathen (iv. 1–3).

As their holy conduct had brought the reproaches of the ungodly upon them, they are referred to the judgment, when they and their accusers should receive a righteous sentence. And because the judgment is at hand, he enjoins them to be sober and watchful; to have fervent charity towards one another; to be hospitable, each employing his gift for the benefit of others; for example, the teacher or prophet uttering the words

of God not his own opinions, and every one ministering out of the ability given him, that God might be glorified in all his instruments (iv. 4–11).

The writer encourages his readers to bear the trial to which God should subject them, with joyful spirit. If they were reproached for Christ's sake they were happy, inasmuch as the Spirit was in them as a spirit of glory and power. They should be careful, however, not to suffer in a bad cause but as followers of Christ; not ashamed, but rather praising God in this respect (iv. 12–16).

The necessity of bearing the judgment which began to threaten the unbelieving, serves to console the suffering (iv. 17–19).

He now addresses the elders of the churches, enjoining them to attend to their duties spontaneously, not for the sake of money, nor lording it over the churches, but being examples to the flock, remembering that their reward would come from the chief Shepherd. The younger should be subject to the elder, none seeking to exercise authority over the rest, but all clothed with humility (v. 1–5).

The closing exhortation relates to humble submission to God's will, sobriety, and watchfulness against the great adversary, whom they are commanded to resist with steadfast faith. To this is appended a prayer for the confirmation of his readers in the truth, with a doxology (v. 6–11).

The conclusion alludes to Silvanus as bearer of the letter; and salutations are sent from the church at Babylon and Mark (v. 12–14).

# THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

## NOTICES OF THE PERSON TO WHOM IT IS ATTRIBUTED.

It is probable that the Mark to whom the second gospel is commonly assigned, is the same who is called John (Acts xiii. 5, 13) and John Mark (Acts xii. 12, 25; xv. 37). If so, he was a native of Jerusalem, the son of Mary, and a friend of the Christians there. In the epistle to the Colossians he is styled the cousin of Barnabas; with which accords the tradition that he was of the tribe of Levi and the priestly line. He accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey, leaving them at Perga in Pamphylia, and returning to Jerusalem. While Paul was on his second missionary tour, Mark accompanied Barnabas to Cyprus. But though the Apostle of the Gentiles had been dissatisfied with his conduct, and refused to have him for an associate on his second journey, they were afterwards reconciled; if the statement in 2 Timothy iv. 11, where it is said that he is profitable to Paul, can be relied upon as proof. Hence he is styled the *fellow-worker* of the Apostle to the Gentiles (Coloss. iv. 11). Nothing certain is known of the remainder of his life, as the traditional accounts of early ecclesiastical writers cannot be relied on. Eusebius says he was with the apostle Peter in Rome, and that after Peter's death, he founded the church of Alexandria, of which Jerome makes him the first bishop. He is said to have suffered martyrdom there.

If the Mark mentioned in 1 Peter v. 13 be identical with John Mark, we have an intimation of the friendship existing between him and the apostle Peter. In that case, he was converted by the latter, and was with him in Babylon or Rome when the first epistle is said to have been written. But some, with Bengel, take *son* in the passage literally, and the epithet *co-elect*[1] as denoting Peter's wife. It is more probable, however, that son means *spiritual son*; though we must allow that the usual term for *convert* in Paul's writings is not employed;[2] and that *co-elect* refers to the church at Rome rather than Peter's wife. No example of a salutation from the writer's wife occurs in any epistle; whereas salutations are sent from churches.

At what time Mark attached himself permanently to Peter cannot be ascertained. It was after Paul's second missionary journey. The New Testament furnishes little information on the point. The connection between them is scarcely intimated in the Acts, although it would not have been out of place there. But tradition often alludes to their association, furnishing distinct and unequivocal notices of companionship between them, which could hardly have originated in 1 Peter v. 13, or have been derived from Acts xii. 12.

The tradition respecting Mark's connection with Peter is embodied in the following passages.

Papias, or John the presbyter according to the relation of Papias, says: 'The presbyter John said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote exactly whatever he remembered; but he did not write in order the things which were spoken or done by Christ. For he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord; but afterwards, as I said, followed Peter, who made his discourses suit what was required, without the view of giving a connected digest of the discourses of our Lord. Mark therefore committed no mistake when he wrote

[1] συνεκλεκτή. [2] τέκνον, not υἱός as here.

down circumstances as he recollected them. For he was very careful of one thing, to omit nothing of what he heard, and to say nothing false in what he related. Thus Papias writes of Mark.' [1]

Irenæus says: 'Matthew wrote a gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and founding a church there. And after their decease, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter.' [2]

Clement of Alexandria, in Eusebius, states: 'In the same books Clement has given a tradition concerning the order of the gospels which he had received from presbyters of old, and which is to this effect: he says that the gospels containing the genealogies were written first; that the occasion of writing the gospel according to Mark was this: Peter having publicly preached the word at Rome, and having spoken the gospel by the Spirit, many present exhorted Mark to write the things which had been spoken, since he had long accompanied Peter, and remembered what he had said; and that when he had composed the gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked it of him. Which, when Peter knew, he neither forbad nor encouraged it.' [3]

[1] *ὁ πρεσβύτερος (Ἰωάννης) ἔλεγε· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ' ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων [λογίων]· ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν, ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. ταῦτα μὲν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.*—Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39.

[2] *Ματθαῖος . . . . γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.*—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 1.

[3] *αὖθις δ' ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς (ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι) ὁ Κλήμης βιβλίοις περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελιων παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων τέθειται, τοῦτον ἔχουσαν τὸν τρόπον. προγεγράφθαι ἔλεγεν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας. τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν. τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξειπόντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντ*

Tertullian affirms that 'the gospel published by Mark may be called Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was;'[1] and Origen states that 'Mark wrote it as Peter directed him.'[2]

Eusebius speaks at length respecting the origin of the gospel, saying that Peter's hearers prevailed upon Mark, *Peter's follower*, to write down the oral teachings, and that the apostle authorised it to be read in the churches. This account is derived from Clement and Papias, with something of the historian's own.[3]

In another work, Eusebius attributes the fact of Peter's not writing a gospel to excessive modesty.[4]

Jerome's testimony is similar to the preceding. He calls Mark the *disciple* and *interpreter* of Peter, says that he wrote a short gospel at the request of the brethren at Rome, and that Peter himself both sanctioned it and authorised its use in the churches. Elsewhere, Jerome, calling Mark Peter's interpreter as before, says that the one dictated and the other wrote.[5] Tertullian and Eusebius related the report as not certain; while Augustine disbelieved it in saying 'Mark follows Matthew as his abridger.'

The varieties of the tradition are noteworthy, some making Mark write during Peter's lifetime, others after his death; some saying that Peter approved and authorised the gospel, others that he neither forbad nor encouraged it. The most probable account is that given by Irenæus. This, however, did not suffice; so that it came to be asserted afterwards that the work was carried out under an apostle's sanction and that he approved of it when done. Apostolic authority must needs be got

*αὐτῷ πώρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα, ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλύσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι.—H. E.* vi. 14.

[1] 'Licet et Marcus quod edidit evangelium, Petri affirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus,' etc.—*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 5.

[2] *ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ.*—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

[3] *H. E.* ii. 15.

[4] *Demonstr. Evang.* iii. 5.

[5] *De Viris Illustr.* c. 8.

for an evangelist's document. Where this is absent, it is found desirable to say that Mark made no mistake in his recollections, as Papias or John the presbyter asserts. The evangelist must be made a correct reporter of an apostle's narratives.

The course of the tradition is easily traced. The gospel was first attached to Peter. Mark wrote it after Peter's death, according to Irenæus. But the credibility of the work was still left vulnerable; and therefore it was said to be written during the lifetime of Peter, who even read and sanctioned it. Eusebius adds to preceding assumptions some of his own; and the gospel at last becomes Peter's in reality as well as name. Tertullian was the first who called it Peter's, without asserting that the apostle read and sanctioned it; Eusebius makes it his emphatically by stating that he authorised it to be read in the churches; and Jerome, improving upon the historian, affirms that Mark wrote down what Peter dictated.

The attestation of the gospel by Peter, or its genuine reproduction of the apostle's preachings, cannot be accepted without limitation, for a comparison with Matthew and Luke does not always show derivation from an eyewitness, but the use of other sources. Thus the double account of the multitude's miraculous feeding (4,000 and 5,000) is not resolved into the single one out of which it arose. Nor are the words of Jesus always reported correctly, as is shown by the twofold statement about rich men entering into the kingdom of God in x. 23, 24, and by the unoriginal declaration in x. 12. To this may be added the form of the question put by the Pharisees in x. 2. Peter's influence upon the gospel can only have been indirect; it has not impressed it with the uniform character of originality. The narratives savour of a later time than Peter's, or Mark's his interpreter; for they have legendary and ideal elements of post-apostolic growth. This is tacitly

admitted by those advocates of the primitive nature of the gospel who represent Mark as rewriting it after a time; or by such as assume that a later hand worked it over.

What meaning did the ancient fathers attach to the word *interpreter*? Is it that Mark put Peter's Aramæan discourses into Greek? or is it nearly equivalent to *secretary*, as if Mark developed and put into style the oral communications of Peter? The latter is the more probable.

### RELATION OF MARK TO THE SECOND GOSPEL.

The statement of John the presbyter, as preserved by Papias and recorded in Eusebius's history, is to the effect that Mark did not write *in order*[1] the things spoken or done by Christ. The obvious meaning of the expression is *arrangement* generally, whether chronological succession or concatenation and grouping. The opposite of *not in order* is *arrangement*.[2] The statement is not applicable to the present gospel, which has the same arrangement as Matthew's or Luke's. Nor has any attempt to show its adaptation to the character of the canonical Greek gospel been successful. *Not in order* means more than *writing some things*, a phrase which stands in the subsequent context, i.e. than isolated facts. What reason could there have been for saying that Mark wrote only *some parts* of the evangelical history or an incomplete gospel so far, when Matthew himself did nothing else? It is impossible to refer the expression *not in order* to isolated facts, anecdotes, adversaria, materials loosely linked together; for the matter of the gospel is as well digested as that of Matthew or Luke. Nor is Meyer's ingenious assumption[3] of a twofold writing being indicated in the frag-

[1] τάξει. [2] σύνταξις.

[3] *Evangelium des Matthæus*, Einleit. pp. 31, 32.

ment of Papias tenable,—the one, immediately after Mark heard the discourses of Peter, which was *not in order*; the other, the writing of the gospel proper, a part of which only[1] is excused and justified as not exhibiting arrangement.[2] This was not thought of by Papias or John the presbyter. Kenrick also conjectures that Mark wrote the materials of his gospel twice; but prudently abstains from any attempt to find an evidence of it in Papias's words.[3]

A careful examination of Papias's testimony shows that it does not relate to our present gospel, nor bring Mark into connection with it as its author. All we learn from it is, that Mark wrote notes of a gospel which was not our canonical one. To escape from this conclusion, it may be said that John the presbyter was not infallible, and therefore we are at liberty to differ from his opinion. So with Papias. The judgments of both may be wrong. In the present instance it may be asserted that the presbyter was mistaken in supposing that Mark did not write *in order*. But the statement is not so much a matter of opinion as of fact; for every one sees that Mark *did* write *an arranged work*, like Matthew's and Luke's. The difficulty of reconciling the testimony of the presbyter with the condition of the present gospel is palpable; and the witness derives importance from his being the oldest. No solid reason can be given for despising him, except the perplexity in which he involves those who believe him to speak of the present gospel. If he means a prior document written by Mark, his testimony is intelligible, and the conclusion it leads to is that a later writer composed the canonical gospel. How then did it come to be attributed to one that did not write it? If there was at first an authentic document of Mark differing from our gospel, how did the latter come into the place of the former without the slightest historical notice of the

[1] ἕνια γράψας. [2] τάξις. [3] *Biblical Essays*, p. 66.

mutual relation between the two? The writings of the fathers usually quoted respecting the origin of the gospels speak of one and the same work, as Baur expressly allows; and if the document of which Papias speaks were not our present gospel, how could this older writing have passed at once into oblivion, and the present gospel, coming in its stead, be reckoned the work of Mark? It is difficult to answer these questions. It does not seem likely that John the presbyter spoke of a proper gospel, but rather a work in the same style with the Clementine Homilies,[1] in which Mark wrote down sayings, narratives, and teachings of the apostle Peter. But Papias and the succeeding fathers already knew the present gospel, of which they speak as though it were Mark's Petrine document. Before their day, during the process of gospel production and literature, another had supplanted the equivocal document written by Mark himself; and to it they carried over the origin assigned to the latter. The transference seems to have been effected silently, without the observation or opposition which it would have elicited in a critical age. It must be admitted that there is no historical trace of such substitution; and that the fathers speak only of our present gospel of Mark. It may be observed, however, that Irenæus, though well acquainted with the four gospels, does not call the second a *gospel*, but *what was preached by Peter*;[2] as if the one work had been substituted for the other imperceptibly, and therefore it were fitting to speak of the one in terms properly applicable to the other. The fathers, being uncritical and credulous, would not scruple to accept a later gospel as Mark's, especially as the tradition of its connection with Peter facilitated the substitution. Their testimony would have passed unchallenged, had we not the account of John the presbyter and internal evidence leading to a more correct conclusion. The original com-

[1] Α κήρυγμα Πέτρου.

[2] τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα.

position of Mark should be carefully distinguished from a proper gospel, or even a document representing faithfully and fully the teachings of Peter. It was an unconnected production written, after the death of the apostle, from recollections which must often have been vague or erroneous. In any case it was not dictated by Peter, as is shown by the doubling of the miracle of feeding the thousands in the desert (chaps. vi., viii.). Perhaps we have a glimpse of this *primitive Mark* in Justin's allusion to a passage found in Mark only, which was in *his*, that is Peter's, memorabilia.[1] After the gospels of Matthew and Luke appeared, we can suppose the facility with which the canonical Mark would supplant unconnected, anecdotical notes. The latter would pass into the category of apocryphal writings and did so, if they were identical with *the gospel of Peter*. Whatever indications of connection with Peter it may furnish; and we are not disposed to deny them; they originated in the use which the canonical Mark made of the primitive document. The present gospel grew out of and displaced Mark's early production.

That Mark was not the writer of the canonical gospel may be inferred from the fact that it is not specially remarkable in particulars relative to Peter. Although the Apostle was one of the two sent to prepare for the paschal supper, Mark does not give his name. The intensity of his repentance, expressed by *bitterly* in Matthew and Luke, is omitted. Nor is the honourable name *Peter* employed by Mark till it was bestowed on him by Jesus. Some account for these omissions by the modesty of Peter, who did not wish to introduce circumstances seeming to exalt himself. This might be more probable if it could be shown that Mark wrote when Peter was alive and with his sanction. But Irenæus says that Peter was dead at the time; and his statement is more credible than those of Clement, Ori-

[1] See *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 106.

gen, Eusebius, and Jerome. If this were so, it sets aside the alleged modesty of Peter as a reason for omissions respecting his personal history. But while no *special* prominence is given to Peter, there are evidences of some partiality towards him. His walking on the sea of Galilee is omitted as giving rise to Jesus's reproof of his faith (Matthew xiv. 28–31). The asking for an explanation of a parable which draws down upon the disciples a reproof of their dull perception, is attributed by Mark to the disciples generally (vii. 17); whereas in Matthew, Peter is the sole interrogator. Peter's words on the mount of transfiguration are excused by his fear (ix. 6). Mark prefers Luke's words to those of Matthew in xix. 27, omitting the worldly question about reward, 'What shall we have therefore,' which is in Matthew. Though the instances of a predilection for Peter are few, they may indicate some influence of Petrine tradition upon the writer's mind, without supporting the hypothesis that Mark was the apostle's *interpreter* or *secretary*.

If our observations be correct, the canonical gospel could not have been the production which Mark wrote from reminiscences of Peter's oral teachings and narratives. The author is unknown. External evidence on the subject is unsatisfactory, and does not prove Mark's authorship of our gospel; neither does it show that it is an echo, more or less complete, of the apostle Peter's teachings. Internal evidence yields more satisfaction.

### ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The gospel may be divided into three parts.

1. Transactions preparatory to the public ministry of Jesus (i. 1–13).

2. His ministry in Galilee (i. 14–x.).

3. His last journey to Jerusalem, with the events that transpired in the city (xi.–xvi.).

1. The first two verses are followed by the appearance and ministry of John the Baptist, with the baptism and temptation of Jesus. Here the evangelist follows Matthew and Luke, the former more than the latter.

2. This section begins with Christ's appearance in Galilee and the calling of four apostles. The healing of a demoniac in Capernaum, of Peter's wife's mother, a leper, a palsied person, the call of Levi, the banquet at his house and the conversation with the Scribes and Pharisees arising out of it, the plucking of the ears of corn by his disciples on the sabbath-day, and the cure of the man with the withered hand, come in immediate succession. Verses 1, 14–20, follow Matthew. But at i. 21 the evangelist passes at once from Matthew to Luke, because he omits the sermon on the mount. But though he leaves Matthew's order for that of Luke, he does not abandon his mode of narration, but follows both it and Luke's in varying proportions. The event described in Luke v. 1–11 is omitted because of Mark i. 16–20.

In iii. 7–35, Mark relates how the multitudes followed Jesus, His choice of twelve apostles, the blasphemy of the Pharisees that He was in league with Beelzebub, His reply, and the visit of His mother and brethren. At the commencement of this section, Mark leaves Luke and returns to Matthew at the place where he had left him before, viz. Matt. xii. 15. Verses 7–12 are an enlargement of Matt. xii. 15, 16. But the choosing of the twelve follows Luke vi. 12–16 ; after which the writer returns to Matthew, passing over the long discourses in Matt. xii. 33–45.

Chapter iv. 1–34. A series of parables is introduced : the sower, the seed growing secretly, and the mustard-seed. The first is parallel with Matt. xiii. 3–23. Verses 21–25 are taken from Luke viii. 16–18, but verses 26–29 are peculiar to the evangelist. The parable of

the mustard-seed (30–32) is from Matthew, not without reference to Luke, as the thirtieth verse compared with Luke xii. shows. The thirty-fourth verse is from Matthew.

In iv. 35–v. 43 are related the stilling of the storm on the sea of Galilee, the healing of the demoniac in the country of the Gadarenes, Jesus's return to the other side of the lake, the cure of Jairus's daughter, and of the woman having an issue of blood. Here the evangelist follows Luke viii. 22–56. He differs from Matthew in describing but one possessed with a devil, and calling him a Gadarene ; whereas the first evangelist has two demoniacs, who were *Gergesenes* not Gadarenes. The name Jairus is also absent from the first gospel.

In vi. 1–6, it is related how Jesus teaches in Nazareth and is contemned by his countrymen. Here the evangelist returns to Matthew, to the passage where the parables ended in the latter, Matt. xiii. 53–58.

The section, vi. 7–44, describes how the twelve were sent forth on their mission, Herod's opinion of Jesus, the execution of John the Baptist, the disciples' return, and the miraculous feeding of the multitude. Luke is followed more than Matthew ; though the latter is not unregarded, especially in verses 32 and 34.

The section, vi. 45–viii. 21, contains an account of Jesus walking on the sea, the discourse relative to the washing of hands, the journey into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon where the daughter of a Canaanite woman is healed, the cure of a person deaf and dumb, another miraculous feeding of multitudes, the demand of the Pharisees for a sign, and a warning against the leaven of the Pharisees. All this is parallel with Matt. xiv. 22–xvi. 12. But the paragraph vii. 32–37 is peculiar to Mark, having been suggested apparently by Matt. xv. 30, where the general statement occurs : 'And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that

were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus's feet, and he healed them.' As Matthew did not describe any individual case of a deaf man being healed, Mark selected one for circumstantial detail. He omits Matthew's words (xvi. 2, 3) at viii. 10–13, and xvi. 11, 12, at viii. 21.

The healing of a blind man at Bethsaida (viii. 22–26) is peculiar to Mark.

The section viii. 27–ix. 50 relates Peter's confession, the transfiguration, the cure of a lunatic, the announcement by Jesus of his suffering, and the dispute among the disciples respecting precedence. It is parallel with both synoptists, Matt. xvi. 15–xviii. 9 and Luke ix. 18–51, but has more agreement with the former. Sometimes the evangelist has from Matthew particulars wanting in Luke, as viii. 32, 33 ; ix. 9 ; ix. 42–47. On the other hand, he has particulars from Luke which are not in Matthew, as viii. 38 ; ix. 38–41. With Luke he omits what Matthew has in xvi. 17–19, 27 ; xvii. 6, 7, 13, 20, 24–27 ; and again, with Matthew, he omits what Luke has in ix. 31–33.

The paragraph x. 1–12 treats of divorce, arising out of a question by the Pharisees. Here the evangelist follows Matthew. Chap. x. 13–16, in which Jesus blesses little children, is from Matthew and Luke ; as is also x. 17–31, where he answers the rich young man. The passage in which Jesus foretells his death, x. 32–34, is also from both. The request of Zebedee's sons, x. 35–45, is from Matthew xx. 20–27 ; and the cure of the blind man near Jericho, x. 46–52, from Matthew and Luke. The principal source of the whole chapter is apparently Matthew, with the occasional use of Luke. It is worthy of remark that Mark follows Luke in recording the cure of only one blind man at Jericho ; not two, as Matthew states. But he agrees with Matthew that the cure took place as he went out of Jericho, whereas Luke says it was as he entered it.

3. The 11th chapter describes Jesus's triumphant entry into Jerusalem, the cursing of the fig-tree, the expulsion of traders from the temple, and a conversation with the Sanhedrists. Here both Matthew and Luke are freely used, except in relation to the withered fig-tree, which is not in the latter evangelist. Mark differs from Matthew in dividing the particulars respecting the fig-tree, and in placing the expulsion of the traders in a different position. Matthew relates that Jesus went into the temple on the evening of the day he entered Jerusalem, and expelled the traders thence; afterwards going to Bethany to pass the night there. As he returned the next morning he cursed the fig-tree, which instantly withered. But Mark makes Jesus go into the temple in the evening of the day he arrived in the city, and go out to Bethany the same evening. The next morning as he returned he cursed the fig-tree, went into the temple and expelled the traders. On the evening of that day he retired again from the city, into which as he was going the next morning, Peter directed attention to the withered state of the fig-tree. The addition which this gospel makes to the incident of the fig-tree, viz. that 'the time of figs was not yet,' increases our belief of the unhistorical character of the incident. The parable of the barren fig-tree was crystallised in the history of the miraculous withering of the same.

The 12th and 13th chapters are occupied with parables and discourses, contrary to the manner of the evangelist. The parable of the vineyard, Jesus's answer to the entangling question of the Pharisees and Herodians about paying tribute, his refutation of the Sadducees respecting marriage in the resurrection-period, his explanation of the highest precepts of the law, his inquiry put to the scribes respecting Christ being the son of David, his reproof of the vain-glory of the scribes and Pharisees, the account of the widow's mite, together with the eschatological discourse in the 13th chapter,

show more or less parallelism with Matthew and Luke. Thus, xii. 1–12 is taken from Matthew xxi. 33–46, and Luke xx. 9–19 ; xii. 13–27 follows the two synoptists also. But xii. 28–34 is after Matthew, and not closely ; xii. 35–37 follows both ; 38–40 is from Luke alone, as is also 41–44. The 13th chapter is much more from Luke xxi. 5–36 ; though it is occasionally filled out with notices from Matt. xxiv.

The 14th chapter commences with the statement that the chief priests and scribes conspired against Jesus. To this it is subjoined that He was anointed by a woman at Bethany, and betrayed by Judas (1–11). Here Matthew is chiefly followed. This is succeeded by the preparation for the last supper (12–16), where Matthew and Luke are combined. The supper itself is described (17–25), the departure for the Mount of Olives (26–28), the prediction of Peter's denial (29–31), Jesus's agony in the Garden of Gethsemane (32–42), his betrayal and apprehension (43–52), his accusation before the high-priest (53–65), and Peter's denial (66–72). Matthew is the source of all this.

The 15th chapter relates how Jesus was brought before Pilate, whose desire was to liberate him, his condemnation and shameful treatment, and his being led away to Golgotha (1–23), taken from Matthew. Mark omits the dream of Pilate's wife, and the act of washing his hands in public. The crucifixion (24–37) is from the first evangelist. Like Matthew, he states that both the malefactors who were crucified with Jesus reviled him. The occurrences which happened at the time of his decease (38–40), the account of the women that stood to look on (40, 41), with that of the entombment (42–47), are chiefly, but not exclusively, from the same evangelist, for xv. 42 has relation to Luke also.

The 16th chapter, containing a record of the resurrection, is from Matthew and Luke, the former being

followed up to the ninth verse, and the latter being abridged from that verse onward.

The analysis just given embodies the fact that the gospel before us is later than those of Matthew and Luke. But this is not accepted by many eminent critics; some of whom, as Ritschl and Thiersch, were led by Baur's *Tendenz-Kritik* into an opposite extreme. Neither is it approved by Wilke, Weisse, Lachmann, Weiss, Meyer, B. Bauer, Ewald, Holtzmann, Weitzsäcker, Michelsen, Reuss, Scholten, Volkmar, Kenrick, and others. Yet these critics do not believe that the primitive Mark of which Papias speaks was identical with the present gospel; for they assume interpolations in the alleged proto-Mark during its process of becoming the canonical work. Here there is ample room for the display of subjectivity, and it figures accordingly. Ritschl, Holtzmann, and Renan admit nothing more than a slight modification of the original. Most scholars, however, find large interpolations; especially Weitzsäcker, Reuss, Wilke, Weisse, and Volkmar. One thing is clear, that the present Mark is not an exact copy of that to which Papias alludes. How far it differs from the prototype can only be a subject of conjecture. Our opinion is that subsequent working over made it pretty much disappear, so that the original is scarcely discernible in its successor. Hilgenfeld and Klostermann adopt the simpler hypothesis that the canonical Matthew is the only source of the present Mark.

The proto-Mark has its foundation in early tradition. The canonical evangelist used a Petrine document which may have been written by Mark himself. But it is hard to find it in his work, whose sources are more easily identified with *existing documents*. That the canonical Mark preceded the other synoptics appears contrary to internal evidence; notwithstanding Volkmar's elaborate attempt to carry out this radical hypothesis. Even he is obliged to assume interpolations

which change its primitive state, to that extent. Holtzmann allows,[1] that Matthew and Luke have some original statements in places where Mark's are not so; while the proto-Mark, in Reuss's opinion,[2] dwindles down to i. 21–vi. 44, viii. 27–xiii. 37.

Two plausible hypotheses present themselves, viz. Mark's dependence on Matthew, or on Matthew and Luke together. The proto-Mark, as an additional source, may be reckoned, but there is difficulty in tracing it.

If Mark's independence of Matthew and Luke be asserted, it becomes necessary to set forth all the arguments that prove the contrary. We proceed to consider the subject more closely.

### RELATION OF MARK TO MATTHEW AND LUKE.

At an early period Augustine thought that Mark was 'the attendant, as it were, and abbreviator'[3] of Matthew, an opinion which cannot be defended without modification. More probable is the view which Griesbach was the first to confirm with good arguments, that the gospel was taken from those of Matthew and Luke, mostly by abridgment but in part by combination.[4] Had the able critic admitted another written source besides these two, his hypothesis would have been impregnable. Yet his essay was an epoch-making one. The following positions appear to be safe.

1. There are frequent examples of verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark, some of them long and remarkable.

| MATTHEW xiii. | MARK iv. |
|---|---|
| 3. Ἰδού, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν. | 3. Ἰδού, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι. |
| 4. Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν ἃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτά. | 4. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. |

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 60, 61. [2] *Nouvelle Revue*, ii. p. 71.

[3] 'Tanquam pedissequus et breviator.'—*De Consensu Evangeliorum*, i. 2.

[4] Griesbach's *Opuscula Academica*, vol. ii. p. 358, etc.

MATTHEW xiii.

5. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλεν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.

6. Ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη.

7. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτά.

8, 9. Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπόν,

ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα,
ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

22. Καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

MARK iv.

5. Ἄλλο δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλεν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.

6. Ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη.

7. Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι, καὶ συνεπνίξαν αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν.

8, 9. Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενον, καὶ ἔφερεν, ἓν τριάκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑκατόν.
καὶ ἔλεγεν,
ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

19. Καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

Similar verbal coincidences are found in Matt. xvi. 13–28 and Mark viii. 27–ix. 1; in Matt. xvii. 1–10, and Mark ix. 2–9.

2. There are also frequent examples of verbal coincidence between Luke and Mark.

MARK x.

14. Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

15. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

17. Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

18. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός.

19. Τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας,
μὴ μοιχεύσῃς,
μὴ φονεύσῃς,
μὴ κλέψῃς,
μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς,
μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς,
τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου
καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

LUKE xviii.

16. Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

17. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

18. Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

19. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός.

20. Τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας,
μὴ μοιχεύσῃς,
μὴ φονεύσῃς,
μὴ κλέψῃς,
μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς,

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου
καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου.

Compare also Mark iii. 4, 5, with Luke vi. 9, 10; Mark i. 24, 25, with Luke iv. 34, 35.

3. In several sections Mark's text agrees partly with Matthew and partly with Luke, so that it seems a compound of both.

| MATTHEW viii. 2–4. | MARK i. 40–44. | LUKE v. 12–16. |
|---|---|---|
| Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth his hand and touched him saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed. | If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth his hand and touched him, and saith to him, I will; be thou clean. And as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed. [Ver. 43 not contained either in Matthew or Luke.] | Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And he put forth his hand and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately the leprosy departed from him. |
| And Jesus saith to him, See thou speak to no man: but go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift which Moses commanded for a testimony unto them. | And saith to him, See thou say nothing to any man; but go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded for a testimony unto them. | And he charged him to speak to no man; but go, show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. |

Compare also Mark ii. 13–22 with Matt. ix. 9–17 and Luke v. 27–39.

4. The whole of Mark's gospel, except twenty-four or twenty-seven verses, is contained either in Matthew's or Luke's. This fact, coupled with the preceding propositions, leads to the conclusion that it was probably compiled from them.

5. Mark's arrangement is always the same as that of Matthew or Luke.

6. It is not likely that Mark would have limited the choice of his facts almost entirely to those which Matthew and Luke record, had he written independently of them.

But it is said that Mark may have written his gos-

pel first, and the synoptists have used it, enlarging its contents and filling it out with new matter. To this we reply, that all ancient historical testimony is to the effect that Matthew wrote first. The portion of the gospel traditions which would be committed to writing in the first instance was the sayings of Christ. Events and incidents would be retained in the memory longer, and would not need to be put into writing. Now Mark has few discourses in comparison with Matthew. He narrates events especially miracles, rather than the sayings of Jesus. This fact militates against the priority of his gospel, and agrees with the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, that Mark was the latest of the synoptists. It is very improbable also that a Roman gospel should have preceded a Palestinian one like Matthew's. And the earliest gospel citations from extra-canonical writings, such as the Gospel of the Hebrews, presuppose the existence of Matthew's and Luke's, not that of Mark exclusively. Internal evidence shows that Mark's gospel is condensed from the others, instead of the others arising by amplification from it. There are also instances of incompleteness which are hardly compatible with the idea of its preceding the other two. In his desire for brevity the writer has occasional examples of obscurity, so that it is necessary to consult the others to get at his meaning. This obscurity has not arisen from Mark being the first evangelist who put the oral gospel into writing, though brevity and incompleteness might attach to the earliest record; because it amounts to incorrectness at times, arising from haste or oversight in employing the sources. If this can be shown, the argument that Mark, having two other gospels before him, would have avoided incongruities and made his own document more perspicuous and unexceptionable than they, will fall to the ground. Thus in the account of the man possessed with a legion of devils, Mark states that the people of the district,

hearing of his cure, came and saw him *clothed* (v. 15), an expression which receives its explanation from Luke viii. 27, which says that he 'ware no clothes.' In xiii. 4, the phrase '*all* these things,' is difficult, for the context specifies the destruction of the temple only. It is borrowed from Matt. xxiv. 6, presupposing what explains it there; for the evangelist represents the disciples as asking Jesus not only about the destruction of the temple, but about his coming and the end of the world. The temptation of Jesus (i. 13) is despatched in a sentence so briefly as to be inadequately apprehended. No mention is made of fasting forty days and nights; though the expression, 'angels ministered to him,' suggests it. Mark adds the new feature, 'he was with the wild beasts,' which savours of a time when superstitious circumstances gathered around the fact, or when the evangelist could add that trait to make the picture more graphic. In vi. 54, we read, 'When they were come out of the ship, *they* knew him.' It is not said who knew him; none but the disciples being previously mentioned. The first gospel shows that it was 'the men of that place' (xiv. 35); words that are in some MSS. and versions of Mark's text; though evidently spurious.

In xv. 39, the centurion's inference that Jesus was a Son of God because he yielded up the ghost after a great cry, is not reasonable or natural. Some other grounds must have led him to the conclusion. The parallel passage in Matthew places the matter in a right view, by relating that the earth quaked, the rocks rent, and the graves opened. After seeing these convulsions of nature, the centurion and those with him were greatly afraid, saying, *Truly this was a Son of God.* The evangelist follows Luke in omitting the earthquake and the opening of the graves; but instead of making the centurion say, as he does in the third gospel, 'Certainly this was a righteous man,' he follows Matthew, 'Truly this was a Son of God.'

In chap. iii. 13–19 Luke is followed in making the selection of the twelve apostles take place on the mountain immediately before the sermon; and the list of names is given awkwardly, because the writer had reference to Matthew x. 2–4 as well as to Luke iii. 13-19. The combination of the two sources makes the succession of names peculiar, and detracts from its naturalness. The connection in which the appointment is put is not indeed the same as in Matthew and Luke; but chap. vi. 7 gives an intimation of its right position.

In chap. iii. 20–22, where Jesus was thronged by the multitude in a house, it is abruptly related that the scribes who came down from Jerusalem objected to him that he cast out devils by Beelzebub. The accusation becomes intelligible only by means of Matthew xii. 22, where it follows the healing of a blind and dumb man.

Again, the evangelist has incorrectnesses arising from a process combining Matthew and Luke, or from the insertion of additional particulars. Thus in the history of the transfiguration, it is stated that Peter did not know what he said, *for they were sore afraid* (ix. 6). The cause of the fear is not given. In Matthew, the corresponding phrase stands in its right place, i.e. after the appearance of a bright overshadowing cloud and the utterance of a voice from the cloud, causing the disciples to fall on their faces (Matt. xvii. 6).

In iv. 13, the reproof which Jesus administers to the disciples is out of place: 'Know ye not this parable, and how then will ye know all parables?' This arose from the idea of the evangelist, that the disciples were praised in the preceding context for their understanding the sense of parables which was hidden from others. But as that was inconsistent with the fact that Jesus explains the meaning of the parable to them which he had just delivered, Mark introduces the explanation by the reproof conveyed in the thirteenth verse. Jesus did not act in this manner. When his disciples asked

the meaning of a parable he willingly gave it, because inquiry was a hopeful sign which he encouraged. After the explanation of the parable, the twenty-fourth verse runs thus: 'And he saith unto them, Take heed what ye hear: *with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you*; and unto you that hear shall more be given.' Here the connection is less suitable than that of Luke from whom the words are taken. 'And he saith unto them,' is less appropriate than Luke's connecting *therefore*; while the words in italics are too general and vague to suit their near context.

In ix. 35–37, where Luke is followed, who also omits Matt. xviii. 3, 4, Mark has given an imperfect and obscure representation. In opposition to the ambition of the disciples, Jesus recommends humility by setting the example of children before them; as we see from Matthew. But Mark's words contain an exhortation to receive and cherish children; so that the true import of the passage is unintelligible without Matt. xviii. 3, 4.

Another remarkable example of the combining process occurs in chapter vi. 14–16, where an employment of the two synoptics can hardly be mistaken. Herod hearing of Jesus's works indentifies him with John the Baptist whom he had beheaded. Then the opinions of others are given, and it is added: 'but when Herod heard thereof he said, It is John whom I beheaded, he is risen from the dead.' The beginning, or the fourteenth verse, is taken from Matthew xiv. 1, 2. The different opinions of the people are next derived from Luke ix. 7, 8, and the 16th verse of Mark vi. reverts to Matthew. Thus Mark begins his account with Matthew's, he continues it with Luke's, and terminates it with Matthew's, or rather repeats unnecessarily what he had already given from Matthew. Had he not looked to Matthew again in this instance, he would have avoided the repetition of Herod's words. The verb *heard* in the 14th verse has no object such as it has in Matthew; the

abridging process obliterating it, though the parenthesis implies its antecedence. And the title *King* Herod is improper. It should be *tetrarch*, as in Matthew and Luke. The reading *they said* in the fourteenth verse, which Lachmann and Fritzsche have adopted after some authorities, is obviously a correction, to make the fourteenth and sixteenth verses agree.

In i. 2, 3, we read, 'As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, Behold I send my messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way. A voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.' Here two different quotations follow the introductory formula *written in Isaiah the prophet*, although the first is from Malachi. The evangelist's mistake arose from his looking exclusively to Matthew and Luke, without considering that an additional citation to theirs made the introductory formula inapplicable in part.

In x. 2–12, the proper question is not given by Mark, in consequence of his omitting the phrase, 'for every cause,' i.e. for any fault which the husband may consider a sufficient cause. How could the Pharisees tempt Jesus by asking him merely, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?'

In xiv. 53–65, we observe the later and less original form in which the circumstances are narrated. The paragraph is taken from Matthew; but when the witnesses represent Jesus as having said, 'I will destroy this temple *made with hands*,[1] and I will build another *made without hands*,'[2] later reflectiveness is observable. Mark also abridges, omitting the difficult expression *hereafter*,[3] Matt. xxvi. 64. because he understood Jesus to speak of his coming again literally. He retains the word *prophesy* alone without its necessary context 'Who is he that smote thee?' (Matt. xxvi. 68.)

The secondary character of Mark's gospel through-

[1] χειροποίητον. [2] ἀχειροποίητον. [3] ἀπ' ἄρτι.

out appears from additions which are made to the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke. The pictorial power by which the evangelist is characterised is often adduced as a mark of originality, as if he had either been an eyewitness of the scenes he describes, or had drawn his details from the oral communications of an eyewitness like Peter. This hypothesis is incorrect, since many passages show that the graphic colouring and vivid details belong to the writer's manner. Thus in the historical narrative respecting Christ feeding five thousand with five loaves and two fishes, the evangelist says, 'He commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the *green* grass. And they sat down in ranks by hundreds and by fifties' (vi. 39, 40); in the transfiguration, 'Jesus's raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, *so as no fuller on earth can white them*' (ix. 3); in the description of the place where the disciples found the colt, 'they found the colt tied *by the door without, in a place where two ways met*' (xi. 4); in the way in which the paralytic person was set before Jesus, 'they uncovered the roof where he was, *and when they had broken it up*, they let down the bed,' etc. (ii. 4); these features show an intention to infuse life into his descriptions. The small additions also, '*with the hired servants*' (i. 20); 'looking round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts' (iii. 5); 'beholding' (x. 21); 'taking up in his arms' (ix. 36; x. 16); 'sitting down' (ix. 35; xii. 41); 'beneath the table' (vii. 28); 'laid upon a bed' (vii. 30); 'sighing deeply in his spirit' (viii. 12); 'was much displeased' (x. 14); 'in the hinder part of the ship asleep on a pillow' (iv. 38); 'and they had a few small fishes, and he blessed and commanded to set them also before them' (viii. 6); 'and looking upon his disciples he rebuked Peter' (viii. 33); 'Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here!' (xiii. 1); 'and the high-priest stood up *in the midst*, and asked Jesus, saying'

(xiv. 60); 'there cometh a maid *of the high-priest*, and when she saw Peter warming himself' (xiv. 66); 'when the centurion that stood by saw that he so cried out and gave up the ghost,' etc. (xv. 39); 'and when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away, for it was very great' (xvi. 4);—are pictorial; and their recurrence proves that they belong to the author's manner. The same feature appears in the sayings and discourses as well as the narratives. Thus Mark makes John the Baptist say, 'I am not worthy *to stoop* and loose the latchet of his sandals' (i. 7); and to the expression, *yielded fruit*, he adds, 'springing up and increasing' (iv. 8). So too he throws into the description of the mustard plant, 'shooteth out great branches' (iv. 32).

That these pictorial amplifications do not belong to the original freshness of the materials, but to the subjectivity of the evangelist, is still more apparent from the mode in which the sententiousness of Christ's sayings is expanded, so that they lose much of their forcible and incisive brevity. This is done by introducing reasons, by explanatory or amplifying adjuncts, and by changing figurative expressions. Thus when Matthew makes Jesus express the idea that meats cannot defile a man, by, 'Whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly and is cast out into the draught,' Mark has, It 'entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, purging all meats,' by which scrupulous exactness the idea may be clearer, but it loses the pregnant force of the original in Matthew. In iv. 39, an additional reason is introduced for allowing a person to cast out devils in the name of Jesus: 'There is no man that shall do a miracle in my name who can speak evil of me lightly,' which makes the general proposition following, 'He that is not against us is for us,' clearer; but the reply of Jesus becomes less emphatic and forcible by the motive adduced. In a similar way, the threat of

hell-fire against those who will not put off selfishness is enforced by the reason, 'Every one shall be salted with fire,' or purified by the fire of trial in the judgment; and this again gives rise to a reference to sacrifices which could not be offered without salt: 'Salt is good, but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another' (ix. 49, 50). Reasons for avoiding hell-fire are appended to the original words, without adding to their strength or lucidity. In like manner, when we read in xiv. 7, 'For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good,' compared with the same in Matt. xxvi. 11, 'For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always,' it is plain that the unnecessary addition, '*whensoever ye will ye may do them good*,' flattens the statement. In xiv. 8, the phrase, 'she did it for my burial,' in Matthew, is altered into the literal but weaker, 'she hath come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying.' So too in iv. 19, the concrete sententiousness of Christ's expressions loses its power by the addition, *the lusts of other things entering in*. 'Cares and riches and pleasures,' which Luke has, bears the stamp of originality, rather than the enlarged form of the phrase in Mark. The same remark applies to the 'many other such like things' of vii. 13. In vii. 22, the enumeration of the things which defile man is drawn out into a complete register of individual sins, as if logical fulness were necessary on the lips of Christ.

The evangelical narrative exhibits similar evidence of designed modifications or amplifications of the primitive record. Thus in xi. 13, the cause of Jesus's not finding fruit on the fig-tree is said to be, 'it was not the time of figs;' an inappropriate reason, because it increases the difficulty attaching to the cursing of the tree. In viii. 3, where the second miraculous feeding

of the multitude is related, the danger of their fainting by the way should they be sent away hungry is accounted for by the fact that 'divers of them came from far.'

These examples prove that the descriptions have not the character of originality. They are graphic, no doubt, in some cases, and the colouring is fresh ; but native simplicity is absent. The pragmatism of the writer is apparent. Design is perceptible, which not unfrequently aims at clearness and vividness of detail by artificial means. Reflectiveness, indicating a later stage of gospel-writing, betrays the non-originality of the document. The older a writing, the more rugged and simple it generally is ; whereas the gospel of Mark presents a diffuseness and circumstantiality of detail which savours of a later period. Had the evangelist been occupied with the original oral traditions, he would not have bestowed so much care on subordinate details ; for the body of the materials would have claimed his attention. It is evident that the main contents of the evangelical history had been already put together when Mark began to write ; and it remained for him to set individual events and circumstances in a clearer light, and to place them in the position of cause and effect. The evangelist is too much of an eclectic to have been one of the first gospel writers. He is more intent on picturesque details than on arranging and combining the body of the history.

Again, the nature of his historical and archæological explanations shows the secondary character of the gospel. They are often unimportant, prosaic, unsuitable and trifling. Thus, *in the days of Abiathar* (ii. 26); the number of the swine (v. 13); *Dalmanutha*, for *the coasts of Magdala* (viii. 10); *a Greek woman, a Syrophenician by birth*, for *a Canaanitish woman* (vii. 26); *Bartimeus*, the name of the blind man at Jericho (x. 46); the minute play of numbers, 'before the cock

crow *twice* thou shalt deny me *thrice*,' in harmony with which three denials are given, whereas the first crowing reminding Peter of the words of Jesus, must have prevented a second denial (xv. 68–72); the paralytic *borne of four* (ii. 3),—are trifling details, the first of them at least incorrect. Nor can it escape the reader's notice, that words of Jesus which sound somewhat hard or severe are softened, so as to yield a less objectionable sense. Thus in x. 23, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God,' is modified into 'How hard is it for them that *trust in* riches to enter into the kingdom of God.' The same cause has operated in the sentence, 'He shall receive an hundredfold *now in this time, houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions*,' where the reward is particularised in correspondence with the loss, but with the added particular *persecutions*. For a like reason, the passage in Matthew respecting men making themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, is left out (Matt. xix. 12). The words of Jesus addressed to the Canaanitish woman, preserved by Matthew in their original form, are modified, so that the clause, 'let the children first be filled,' is inserted before 'it is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to the dogs' (vii. 27).

In like manner, the peculiar stress which Mark's gospel lays upon the expulsion of demons from the possessed, bespeaks a later period than Matthew's. The main purpose of the Messiah is represented to be the destruction of evil spirits as a necessary condition of establishing his divine kingdom in the world. And the conflict of Jesus with the powers of darkness is put in a stronger light by Mark than it is by Luke. Hence our gospel proceeds at once to a case of demon subjugation (i. 23).

It has been already said that the Petrine gospel of Mark was used in the present one. This should be

remembered in any examination of the portions peculiar to the latter. The evangelist was not confined to Matthew and Luke for his information; neither can his details be explained by referring them to his own subjectivity. But it is difficult to believe, with Holtzmann and others, that the primitive Mark (or Petrine gospel) was the most copious source of the present one, much less that it was the common basis of the three synoptics. The material derived from it appears but seldom in its original state, being incorporated with that which comes from the usual sources. It is visible in different places and forms; especially in the prominence given to Capernaum as Peter's home. After Jesus is rejected in Galilee, he begins to manifest his miraculous power by healing a demoniac in the synagogue in Capernaum.

Care should be taken to distinguish between the traits that proceed from the evangelist himself and such as come from a written source. All the peculiarities of the gospel are not the writer's own composition. While its secondary character can hardly be mistaken, some features are drawn from written sources; and some original modes of representation give Mark the preference over Matthew and Luke. It is probably on the basis of these, that various scholars claim for the second gospel priority in time and genuineness, believing that it presents the original account; though the primitive parts are in reality fewer and less important than those which show its secondary aspect. Mark xiii. 32 is more original than Matthew xxiv. 36; the words *not even the Son* being omitted in the latter. The same remark applies to Mark xiii. 4, compared with Matthew xxiv. 3; the phrase *and of the end of the world* in the latter being an addition. Peter's profession of faith in Christ is authentic, 'Thou art the Christ' (viii. 29), rather than 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God,' which Matthew gives (xvi. 16). Other materials of an original type will catch the eye of the attentive reader. Thus in

i. 36, the notice that Simon and they who were with him followed Jesus to bring him back to Capernaum, probably came to the evangelist as part of a written work. The same remark applies to the narrative of the young man in Gethsemane who followed Jesus (xiv. 51); to the notice that Jesus would not suffer any man to carry a vessel through the temple (xi. 16); the observation about Pilate wondering that Jesus was dead so soon (xv. 44, 45); the mention of Bethsaida (vi. 45); the works of Jesus in Decapolis (vii. 31); and the declaration respecting the sabbath (ii. 27). In like manner, the statement that Herod was a willing hearer of John the Baptist's, and did many things which the prophet recommended (vi. 20), points to an original source, as is even implied in the remark of Matthew about Herod's sorrow at Herodias's request. It is less original and probable in Mark that he makes James and John prefer their own ambitious request, instead of their mother as Matthew does; since the former evangelist had just said before of the apostles that *they were amazed and afraid* as they followed their Master (x. 32). Matthew does not therefore soften down Mark's narrative in this place, as Kenrick supposes. The examples adduced in favour of Mark being the protevangelium are appropriate in some cases, but cannot outweigh the mass of evidence to the contrary. It is easy, for example, to quote passages in which Mark is not the epitomiser of Matthew or Luke; in which he puts things in a more original form or is fuller and more circumstantial; but *the general character* remains the same. The gospel is a dependent one, briefer in contents, eclectic, with some graphic details which give life to the description.

CHARACTERISTICS.

1. The gospel is catholic, undoctrinal, and neutral. It is without the strong Judaic elements which are abundant in Matthew. Such expressions as, 'I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' 'the holy place' for the temple, are absent. The house of prayer is said to be 'for all the nations;' and the external literal observance of the sabbath is reproved. The universal destination of Christianity, which is termed *new doctrine* (i. 27), is declared (xiii. 10). In conformity with this, great stress is laid on the power of faith to save (v. 34; ix. 23; x. 52; and especially xvi. 16). But no direct opposition to Judaism is expressed. The Jewish nation generally is not the subject of severe rebukes; on the contrary, with the exception of the Sanhedrists, Pharisees, Herodians, and his own relatives and countrymen, Jesus obtains a favourable reception, and has his divine authority admitted. The denunciations of John the Baptist addressed to the Jewish people, the allusion to the Ninevites, the threatenings of the unbelieving cities, and such like, which appear in Matthew and Luke, are absent. The dogmatic element recedes probably because certain dogmas were not yet elevated into importance enough to become criteria of ecclesiastical orthodoxy. Accordingly, the gospel has nothing of the supernatural birth of Jesus, though it must have been believed in the writer's day. The absence of that history which records the conception, birth, and childhood of Christ, should not be adduced as a proof of the gospel's early origin, as it is by some, for the writer presupposes it as in the synoptics, and develops it even to its negative consequences. Instead of Matthew's 'Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary?' Mark has 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?' which agrees better with birth from a

virgin than the genealogical registers, where Joseph intervenes in order to deduce the Davidic descent of Jesus. Mark applies *son of David* to Christ only once (x. 47). We infer, therefore, that the omission of the genealogies by this evangelist arose out of a later circle of ideas than the analogous ones in Matthew and Luke. The gospel betrays a tendency to omit all that could give direct offence to the Jewish and Gentile Christians. It passes over the points of difference between the parties—those which were the cause of controversy. Theoretical principles or fundamental positions are avoided. The author selects, limiting himself to common ground, with the object of promoting union and bringing about one faith. He gives the basis on which the later Jewish Christianity united with Paulinism, the incipient beliefs which led to the developed ones of the catholic Church. The characterless neutrality of the gospel was an important factor in conciliating antagonistic parties.

2. The gospel presents Christ as a divine person, not so much in his discourses as in the mighty works and miracles he performed. The former are a subordinate feature. His divine nature is not spoken of, but the acts that show him divine. The extraordinary influence he possessed has special prominence. Hence his power over demons is held up to view more emphatically than in any of the synoptics ; and the thronging crowds that press on him on every side give a vivid picture of the effect produced. The figure of the Redeemer is a commanding one, overawing and dazzling. The doubts of the Baptist respecting him are not mentioned ; *he calls unto him whom he would* (iii. 13) ; and the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is resolved into calumny against Jesus (iii. 30). The very incapacity of the disciples to recognise the Messiah in Him, and to apprehend the object of His ministry, is described more strongly in order to show the greatness and majesty of His person. Thus He does

not appear as a teacher, but rather as the founder of a divine kingdom; putting forth marvellous manifestations of the higher power that enabled him to vanquish both spiritual and human adversaries. The teacher is subordinate to the doer of mighty works; the mild, persuasive, authoritative instructor, such as he appears in the sermon on the mount, becomes a great personage who sets up an imperishable kingdom by the overwhelming power of his acts.

3. We observe a tendency to separate discourses addressed to the disciples from those meant for such as were *without*; in other words, a distinction is drawn between Jesus's esoteric and exoteric teaching. Thus in vii. 17 we read, 'When he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable.' So in x. 10, his disciples asked him about the subject of marriage '*in the house*.' And in iv. 34, after saying that Jesus spoke to the people only in parables, it is added, 'when they were alone he expounded all things to his disciples.' Another example is in iv. 10, 11, where it is specified that when Jesus was alone he was asked the meaning of a parable by his disciples, who are expressly separated from *those without*. This belongs to Matthew and Luke in a less degree.

4. The vivid description and graphic details of Mark have been already spoken of. In this respect he forms a striking contrast to Matthew. He shows a decided preference for the present tense, and introduces persons themselves as speakers, where the other synoptists employ the third person. His striving after minuteness has led to the specification of persons (i. 20; iii. 6, 17, 32, 34; iv. 11; v. 32, 37, 40; vi. 40, 48; vii. 1, 25, 26; viii. 10, 27; ix. 15, 36; x. 16, 23, 35, 46; xi. 21, 27; xiii. 1, 3; xiv. 20, 37, 65; xv. 7, 21, 40, 47; xvi. 7); places (i. 28; iv. 1, 38; v. 11, 20; vi. 55; vii. 31; viii. 10, 27; ix. 30; xii. 41; xv. 16, 39; xvi. 5); and time (i. 32, 35; ii. 1, 26; iv. 35; vi. 2; xi. 11, 19, 20;

xiv. 1, 12, 17, 30, 68, 72 ; xv. 1, 25, 33, 34, 42 ; xvi. 1, 2).

We have already said that the vividness of description which Mark usually effects by inserting details unknown to Matthew and Luke, does not necessarily imply an eyewitness or more originality than that of the other synoptists. On this point many critics are misled, because they do not consider *the character* of the delineations supposed to indicate priority of time to those of Mark and Luke. It has been argued that the manner in which our evangelist represents the performance of miracles shows an earlier form of the gospel tradition. We are reminded of the fact that Mark recognises the use of natural means in several instances (vi. 5, 13 ; vii. 32). But this indicates a later reflectiveness. Had it been the common belief from the beginning that the miracles were within the compass of natural causes, we might suppose that Mark represents an earlier form of the tradition than the evangelists who omit all notice of the natural ; but as that is incorrect, the natural element is the creation of a later period, not a remnant of the earliest.

In like manner, the narratives of Mark respecting the expulsion of demons by Jesus, while more emphatic and more frequent than in the other synoptics, have certain peculiarities which consign them to a later period. The gradual development of Jesus's Messianic consciousness is a phenomenon commonly admitted by critics to lie in the second gospel, yet the persons possessed by demons whom he dispossessed are said to know him as the Son of God. There is only one case of such knowledge in Matthew, viz. that of the possessed Gadarenes ; in Mark and Luke the peculiarity is usual. The demoniacs know Jesus to be the Messiah at a time when his immediate disciples seem to have been ignorant of it. Surely this trait in Mark's narratives of the possessed argues a later point of view than Matthew's. The peculiar

prominence given to the healing of demoniacs in the second gospel, coupled with the pictorial circumstances which add life to the description, are in character with the method of the evangelist, and his leading desire to set forth the power of Christ over demons. The details are not an evidence of historical originality but of the reverse. Thus in the cure of the lunatic boy, Matthew has (xvii. 17), 'Bring him hither to me;' and Jesus rebuked the demon which came out of the sufferer, so that the boy was healed forthwith. But Mark represents Christ as questioning the father about the duration of the malady, and describes the violence of the paroxysm following the command addressed to the evil spirit to come out, which left the boy to all appearance dead, till Jesus took him by the hand and raised him up (Mark ix. 20, etc.). The additional features show the writer's object to set the power of Jesus in a more striking light by contrast with the violence of the demon. Nor does this detract from the instantaneousness of the cure as described by Matthew. The wonder is increased in the second gospel, which favours the idea that it represents a later view. When Mr. Kenrick asserts, in relation to such miracles, that Mark wrote simply to record, Matthew and Luke to impress and convince, he mistakes the genius of the first and second gospels. The desire of Mark *to impress* is apparent throughout; while *simple recording* is obvious in Matthew. The wish *to impress* the reader accounts for many characteristics of the second gospel, and for the absence of particulars contained in the first. It even leads to a few exaggerations, as in xi. 10, where, after 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord,' it is added apparently to strengthen the preceding, 'Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David.' The two miracles of healing which are peculiar to Mark, viz. vii. 32–36; viii. 22–26, have something singular about them which betrays a later type. In both cases Jesus is said

to *spit* on the patients. Had Mark written first, it is unlikely that later evangelists would have omitted this circumstance or the miracles themselves. But if he succeeded Matthew and Luke, it is easy to account for the two by supposing him to have taken them from another source.

### TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

It is impossible to ascertain the precise time when the gospel was written. The Paschal chronicle and other authorities place it A.D. 40; Eusebius, in his Chronicon, in the third year of Claudius, i.e. A.D. 43. The two most ancient testimonies, those of Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, are irreconcilable; the former stating that the gospel was composed after Peter's death; the latter, while he was alive. But they agree in this, that it was written in Rome after Peter's alleged arrival there; that is, after the beginning of A.D. 63. External testimony is worthless; we must have recourse to the internal. Taking for granted at present the integrity of the gospel, the twentieth verse of the 16th chapter shows that the apostles had left Judea and preached in many places before the evangelist wrote. We also see, from comparing ix. 1 with Matthew xvi. 28, that the writer thought it necessary to put the coming of the Son of Man to set up his kingdom farther forward than Matthew, *till they see the kingdom of God coming with power*; i.e. till they see its powerful effects upon earth. The eschatological discourse given in the 13th chapter has the words '*in those days* after that tribulation' (verse 24), showing that the writer did not put the coming of Christ *immediately after* the destruction of Jerusalem. There is an alteration in the words employed by the first evangelist; but Mark avoids putting a long interval between the catastrophe of the Jewish nation and the second advent, contenting him-

self with the vague phrase *in those days*. The fact that *gospel*,[1] in i. 1, is used in the sense of gospel-history, argues a late period; and the expression in xvi. 16, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' savours of a time when peculiar efficacy was attributed to baptism. Probably the phrase *and is baptized* was taken from Matt. xxviii. 19, but a different turn is given to it. Yet the recollection implied in the notice that Simon was the father of Alexander and Rufus, prevents the gospel from being put too late into the second century. That it belongs to this century must be inferred, not only from the priority of Matthew and Luke, but from the fact that it was not known to Papias, and probably not much outside Rome. A passage in Clement's epistle to the Corinthians has been thought to show acquaintance with the gospel. But this is more than doubtful.[2] In like manner, it is uncertain whether Hermas used it. No clear trace of it can be found before Justin Martyr, who, though acquainted with it, has no express quotation; for the one passage in which some find his use of it, is taken from the 'Memoirs' or gospel of Peter, i.e. of which Peter was the author, not Mark's gospel, which was not referred to Peter so early.[3] Yet Justin employed Matthew and Luke. If he did not use Mark so much, it had no particular value in his eyes, supposing him to have been acquainted with it when in Rome. Perhaps the date of 120 A.D. is as near as we can get.

The weight of ancient testimony is in favour of Rome as the place of composition. Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, etc., assign it to that place. In favour of this, Latinisms have

[1] εὐ αγγέλιον.

[2] Comp. xv. 2 with Mark vii. 6. See Isaiah xxix. 13.

[3] *Dialog. cum Tryph.* c. 106. Compare Mark iii. 16, 17. The αὐτοῦ (ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ) refers to Peter as the author, but Otto thinks the reading corrupt. Archbishop Thomson asserts that Justin has fourteen quotations from Mark, but does not condescend to give them; most, if not all, being imaginary. See Justin's *Dialog.* by Otto, p. 380, 3rd edition; and the Introduction to the *Speaker's Commentary, N. T.* vol. i. p. lxi.

been adduced,[1] and the custom of explaining Greek expressions by Roman ones. But several Latin words[2] appear in Matthew and Luke also. And it was natural, if the evangelist wrote at Rome, to state that Simon was the father of Alexander and Rufus; since one of these persons at least seems to have resided there (Rom. xvi. 13).

If Rome be the place of writing, as is generally allowed, it furnishes an argument against the gospel being written first. Judea, not Rome, was the locality in which the life of Jesus was earliest known and treasured in the disciples' memory, prior to being committed to writing. We can hardly conceive of the primitive gospel originating out of Judea. The dispersion of Jesus's followers in distant lands was a comparatively late event.

### INTEGRITY.

The last eleven verses of the gospel have been thought not to belong to it. External and internal arguments are adduced in favour of this view. Let us notice them briefly.

1. The portion is wanting in B. ℵ, k. L. stops at the eighth verse, and gives, with a few words of introduction, another conclusion of the gospel; after which it proceeds with the usual one. The same conclusion occurs in the margin of the later Syriac, in *k* or the cod. Bobbiensis of the old Latin, and two Æthiopic MSS. The scholia of several cursive codices, as 1, 199, 206, 209, state that it was absent from some copies. Three of these say that *Eusebius canonised* up to the eighth verse, that is, his canons extended no farther. To the same effect, Birch affirms that the sections of Mark's gospel are not numbered beyond xvi. 8, in the best MSS. This evidence is important against the paragraph's authenticity.

[1] σπεκουλάτωρ, κεντυρίων, ξέστης, τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι (satisfacere), ἐσχάτως ἔχειν (in extremis esse), συμβούλιον διδόναι (consilium dare).

[2] πραιτώριον, κοδράντης, δηνάριον, κῆνσος, λεγεών, φραγελλόω.

It is confirmed by Jerome, Victor of Antioch, Hesychius of Jerusalem, and Severus of Antioch. Dr. Burgon, however, resolves these testimonies into Eusebius alone, whom they seem to have copied.[1] Epiphanius and Cæsarius, in saying that the number of sections in the four gospels is 1162, imply that the paragraph was omitted. Here again Burgon resolves Cæsarius's account into Epiphanius's.[2] He cannot easily dispose of the latter. The section is also absent from some old MSS. of the Armenian version, and from an Arabic version in the Vatican which Scholz examined in a few places. Nor is there any trace of acquaintance with it on the part of Clement of Rome or Clement of Alexandria.

On the other side, it is affirmed that all Greek MSS. except B. and ℵ have the paragraph; for example, A. C. D. E. G. H. K. L. M. S. U. V. X. Γ. Δ.; all evangelistaria and all synaxaria. Scholia in cursive MSS. say that it was found in *many* or *very many* and *accurate* copies. Some of these speak of its being in 'the true Palestinian exemplar,' while others on the same side declare, that they had been collated with approved copies preserved at Jerusalem. About 30 cursives contain scholia in favour of the paragraph. What is meant by the authentic Palestinian or Jerusalem codex, spoken of in several notes, it is hard to say. Was the autograph transferred to Palestine, and deposited in its metropolis? Little weight can be attached to the statement.

The ancient versions, including copies of the old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito, later Syriac, Curetonian, and the Jerusalem Syriac, have it. It is also sanctioned by Irenæus, Hippolytus, the Apostolical Constitutions, Aphraates the Persian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Victor of Antioch, Hesychius of Jerusalem, the author of the *Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ*, and Cyril of Alexandria. Nestorius quotes the 20th verse. These

[1] *The last twelve Verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 51, etc.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 133.

fathers, however, are not independent witnesses. They may be resolved into a very few, chiefly into Irenæus. Numbers do not count for much.

Among internal considerations, it is alleged against the passage, that there is—

1. An incongruity between the ninth verse and what precedes. The words *early on the first of the week*[1] naturally belong to the participle *was risen*,[2] since the writer in describing the appearances of Jesus has no regard to time or place (compare 12, 14, 15, 19). Thus Jesus is said to have risen *early*, although the women who visited the sepulchre *very early* learned that he had risen *before* their visit (verse 4).

Again, *first*[3] connected with *appeared*[4] is unsuitable, because the appearance to Mary Magdalene was not the first. It is beside the mark to say with Robinson[5] that *first*[6] is put *relatively*, not *absolutely*, the first of the three appearances narrated by Mark.

2. The phraseology and style of the section are unfavourable to its authenticity. Phrases and words are introduced which Mark never uses; or terms for which he employs others. Thus for πρώτῃ σαββάτου, meaning the first day of the week (verse 9), ἡ μία τῶν σαββάτων occurs in xvi. 2. The phrase, *out of whom he had cast seven devils*, is attached to the name of Mary Magdalene, though she had been mentioned three times before without such appendix, and seems to have been taken from Luke viii. 2. Instead of ἐκβάλλειν ἀπό, Mark uses ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ (vii. 26), or ἐκβάλλειν with the accusative. In the tenth and fourteenth verses there are sentences without a copulative; whereas Mark has always the copulative in such cases, particularly καὶ. The use of ἐκεῖνος in verses 10, 11, 13, synonymously with ὁ δέ (compare Mark iv. 11; vii. 15, 20; xii. 4, 5;

[1] πρωὶ πρώτῃ σαββάτου.
[2] ἀναστάς. [3] πρῶτον. [4] ἐφάνη.
[5] *Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek*, p. 232. [6] πρῶτον.

xiv. 21), is peculiar. The verb *πορεύεσθαι* occurs three times in the section, though the evangelist never employs it elsewhere. *θεᾶσθαι* is also unknown to Mark (xvi. 14). So also *ἀπιστεῖν* (xvi. 16). *μετὰ ταῦτα* (12) is never employed by the evangelist. *μὲν* and *δὲ* correspond in two members of a sentence (19, 20), which is but once in the gospel (xiv. 38), where the words of another person are cited. *ὁ Κύριος*, meaning *Christ* (19, 20), is unknown to Mark; so also are *ἕτερος* (12), *παρακολουθέω*, *βλάπτω*, *πανταχοῦ*, *ἐπακολουθέω*, *συνεργέω*, *βεβαιόω*. *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις* is Pauline; and *κόσμον ἅπαντα* is peculiar. *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (17), for *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* (compare ix. 37, 41; xiii. 6) and *χεῖρας ἐπιθεῖναι ἐπί τινα* instead of *τινι* (compare v. 23; vi. 5; vii. 32; viii. 23) deserve attention. Other peculiarities and *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* may be accounted for by the new subject, e.g. *γλώσσαις καιναῖς λαλεῖν*, *ὄφεις αἴρειν*, *θανάσιμον πίνειν*, *καλῶς ἔχειν*, *φανεροῦσθαι*, *μορφή*, *ὕστερον*. Short as the section is, it has upwards of twenty phrases and words that do not occur in the gospel.

The style is abrupt and sententious, not graphic, resembling that of brief notices extracted from larger accounts and loosely combined.

3. The seventeenth and eighteenth verses contain suspicious circumstances—an excessive love of the miraculous. Miracles and the power of performing them are attributed to *all believers*. The handling of deadly serpents and the drinking of deadly poison with impunity, savour of superstition. The phrase, 'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved' (16), is also of a late type.

4. A new section begins with the ninth verse, as is shown by the note of time prefixed; but a note of time had been already introduced at the second verse of the chapter. The events recorded in the ninth and subsequent verses require no new note of time.

5. It is strange that when Mark had said that Jesus should appear to the disciples in Galilee (xiv. 28, and xvi. 7), he makes no allusion to the fulfilment of the promise. Verses 15–18 refer to his appearance at Jerusalem.

6. The section is like an excerpt from John, Luke, Matthew, and the Acts.

It is difficult to decide between the conflicting evidence. The fact that Irenæus[1] had the paragraph before him in his copy of the gospel, outweighs the evidence of many MSS. which omit it. Besides Irenæus's attestation of the nineteenth verse, we have a still earlier one (for verses 15–19)[2] in the 'Acts of Pilate,' incorporated in the 'Gospel of Nicodemus.' But the relation of the *Acts* now known to the early work which Justin and Tertullian had, is too uncertain to admit of an argument being built upon it. Celsus also shows acquaintance with the paragraph when he says, 'Who saw this? A demented woman, as ye say,'—referring to Mary Magdalene, to whom Jesus first appeared, and out of whom he had cast seven demons (xvi. 9). The phraseology certainly differs from that of the rest of the gospel perceptibly. But the difference may be accounted for by the use of another source, which the evangelist chose to follow here, much more than Matthew or Luke—the Petrine narrative of Mark, to which Papias refers. It is difficult to believe that the writer could stop with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. No evangelist would do so; and therefore those who impugn the authenticity, have recourse to some sudden accident which prevented the evangelist from finishing properly. A reason why the paragraph was omitted in many copies, is hinted at by Jerome,[3] Eusebius,[4] and others.

[1] *Adv. Hæres.* iii. 10. 6. [2] See Tischendorf's *Evangelia Apocrypha*, p. 243.

[3] 'Omnibus Græciæ libris pæne hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, præsertim cum diversa atque contraria evangelistis cæteris narrare videatur.' —*Ad Hedibiam*, Quæst. ii.

[4] τὰ δὲ ἑξῆς (the verses in question) σπανίως ἔν τισιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι

Exegetical reasons may have led to it, since the difficulty of reconciling xvi. 9 with Matt.. xxviii. 1 was palpable. The time in the second verse does not suit that of the ninth; nor do the seventeenth and eighteenth verses agree with Matt. xxviii. 16–20. Such difficulties may have occasioned its exclusion from many copies, especially Greek ones. That so many authorities, including the old Latin and the Vulgate, have it, is good evidence in its favour. The very difficulties inherent in it did not cause its exclusion. If Eusebius and Jerome believed that it is spurious, why did they resort to another method of solving the difficulties arising from the time of the resurrection specified there? Besides saying that it was absent from some or many copies, both give an additional solution, consisting in an alteration of the punctuation. One is sufficient, viz. that the paragraph is no part of the gospel. By resting in this, they would have saved themselves trouble and shown their real conviction. Dr. Burgon supplies a reason for the omission of the paragraph from many copies, which is at least ingenious. Some very ancient copyist seeing τὸ τέλος written after the eighth verse, assumed that it denoted *the end* of the gospel; whereas it was only a liturgical sign, marking the end of an ecclesiastical lesson. According to this conjecture, the omission was caused by the sheer error and misconception of a solitary scribe. It is remarked in addition, that Mark's gospel was usually the last of the four in the West; so it might easily happen that the last leaf of a MS. was missing with these verses written upon it. These conjectures, for they are nothing else, are improbable. They may account for the omission in a few copies; but to hold that the inadvertence of one scribe, or the torn away leaf of a MS., led so many astray, copyists

φερόμενα περιττὰ ἂν εἴη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ.—Quæst. i. *Ad Marinum.*

and fathers, cannot be accepted. The cause is too small to explain so wide a result. On the whole, the evidence is rather against the authenticity of the paragraph. This is true of the external and internal, considered separately as well as conjointly. The external, consisting of the oldest and best MSS., ℵ and B., with the stopping of Eusebius's canons at xvi. 8, and his statement that it is not 'in the accurate copies,' only 'in some,' 'certainly not in all,' outweighs a mass of later evidence.[1] And though Jerome copied, or even translated Eusebius, it can scarcely be thought that he would have done so ignorantly, without any knowledge of the facts themselves. Did the monk of Bethlehem know nothing of 'the true Palestinian exemplar,' of which scholia speak, when he repeats Eusebius's assertion about the absence of the paragraph from almost all the Greek codices? As to the *internal*, it preponderates against Mark's own authorship. But when we consider that the gospel was not written till the second century, internal evidence loses some of its force against the authenticity. We are disposed to believe that the verses in question formed no part of the original gospel, notwithstanding Burgon's confident assertion that they were 'wrought in the same heavenly loom' with the rest. Through some unknown circumstance, the writer stopped without concluding his work. Another appended the paragraph in the same century (the second) in which the gospel first appeared.

How persons who believe that the verses did not form a part of the original gospel of Mark, can say that they have a good claim to be received as a genuine part of the second gospel or of canonical scripture, passes comprehension. If an unknown writer appended to the gospel a section containing difficulties which make its agreement with the evangelist's own statements all

[1] '*Quæstiones ad Marinum*,' in Mai's *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vol. iv. p. 255, etc.

but impossible, how can he have been *plenarily inspired?* Does the fact of his adding a portion to a gospel show his possession of the gift? It does not depend on the author's being known, that what he composes should be a proper part of the word of God. So some affirm. On what then *does* it depend? On the inspiration of the writer? How is the inspiration of the writer shown? Only by what he writes. In the present case, the later author, as some believe, must have been inspired. Is that proved by the character of this portion? Is it proved by the fact, that whereas an inspired evangelist wrote i.–xvi. 8, another wrote a few verses at the end in an inferior style? Every view of the case shows the absurdity of maintaining that the verses before us are an authentic part of the gospel, equally authoritative with the rest of it, though they proceeded from a different author.

### PERSONS FOR WHOM THE EVANGELIST WROTE, AND HIS OBJECT IN COMPILING A GOSPEL.

The work is the production of a Jewish Christian, and was intended for Gentile believers. Hence localities in Palestine, with Jewish usages and rites, are explained. Thus in i. 5: 'And there went out unto him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in *the river of* Jordan, confessing their sins;' for which the first gospel has, 'and were baptized of him *in Jordan*, confessing their sins' (iii. 6).

'*And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast*; and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast?' (ii. 18). The explanatory clause at the commencement is not in Matthew.

'For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of

the elders' (vii. 3). Compare this with Matthew's words, 'Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread' (xv. 2).

'Then come unto him the Sadducees, *which say there is no resurrection*; and they asked him, saying,' etc. (xii. 18).

'And the first day of unleavened bread, *when they killed the passover*, his disciples,' etc. (xiv. 12).

'Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired' (xv. 6).

No passages are quoted to show the fulfilment of prophecy, except they are unavoidably introduced into the discourses of Jesus. Hence *the law* does not occur.

In the charge to the disciples the words, 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles' (Matt. x. 5, 6), are omitted. In accordance with this view, explanations of words which would otherwise be unintelligible to Gentiles are given, as *Talitha cumi*, *Boanerges*, *Corban*, *Bartimeus*, *Gehenna* (ix. 43).

Thus it appears that Gentiles were the readers for whom the gospel was written.

The object of the evangelist seems to have been a conciliatory one. He meant to instruct Gentile converts in the leading facts of Jesus's life on earth by giving, as far as possible, such a selection as might be acceptable, avoiding doctrinal or controversial ground. Hence it has neither the narrow Jewish elements to be found in the gospel of Matthew, nor the specific Pauline elements of Luke's. 'The christology, indeed, has a tendency towards docetism, but not a decided one.' Epiphanius says that the Docetæ preferred the second gospel to the rest.[1] Credner has put the Clementine Homilies by the side of Mark;[2] for although they never quote it, they presuppose its existence. Of the three places he specifies, one at least, Hom. iii. 57, is from Mark xii. 29.

[1] *Adv. Hæres.* iii. 11. 7.

[2] *Beiträge*, vol. i. p. 300.

### STYLE AND DICTION.

The style is forcible, concise, abrupt.

1. *Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον* occurs eleven times; Luke uses it six times and Matthew twice. The last prefers phrases with *δαιμονιζόμενος*.

2. Diminutives are frequent, as *θυγάτριον*, *κοράσιον*, *κυνάριον*, *ὠτάριον*, *πλοιάριον*, *παιδίον*, *ἰχθύδιον*.

3. *Συμβούλιον ποιεῖν*, iii. 6; xv. 1. Matthew has *συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν*.

4. *Ἐπερωτᾶν* occurs twenty-five times; Matthew has it eight times, and Luke eighteen.

5. *Διαστέλλεσθαι* five times; only once in Matthew.

6. *Εἰσπορεύεσθαι* eight times; Luke has it four times, and Matthew once.

7. *Ἐκπορεύεσθαι* eleven times; Matthew has it six times, and Luke three.

8. *Παραπορεύεσθαι* four times; Matthew once.

9. *Εὐαγγέλιον* occurs eight times; in Matthew four times.

10. *Περιβλέπεσθαι* six times; once in Luke.

11. *Πρωΐ* six times; twice in Matthew.

12. *Φέρειν* fourteen times; in Matthew and Luke four times each.

13. *Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*, referrring to the future resurrection of Christ (viii. 31; x. 34); Matthew has it but once. He and Luke use instead *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*.

14. *Βλέπετε ἀπὸ* viii. 15; xii. 38; Matthew and Luke have instead *προσέχετε ἀπό*.

15. *Ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ* is the prevailing usage of Mark. Only in two places has he *ἀπό*, the latter preposition being the most frequent one in Matthew, and perpetual in Luke, with two exceptions (ii. 1; vi. 19).

16. *Ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης* vi. 14; Matthew and Luke have *Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετράρχης*.

17. Mark accumulates negatives, as *οὐδείς*, twice, xvi. 8; *οὐκέτι οὐ μή* xiv. 25; *μηδενὶ μηδέν* i. 44; *οὐκ οὐδείς* iii. 27; v. 37; vi. 5; xii. 14; xiv. 60, 61; xv. 4; *μηκέτι μηδέ* ii. 2; *οὐκέτι οὐδείς* v. 3; vii. 12; ix. 8; *μηκέτι μηδείς* xi. 14; *μὴ μηδέ* iii. 20.

18. He uses synonymous or tautological expressions, as in i. 42; ii. 19, 25; iii. 7, 8; iv. 6, 30, 39, 40; v. 12, 19, 23, 33; vi. 55, 56, etc. etc.

19. Mark strengthens expressions by appending their opposites, as in ii. 27; iii. 26, 29, etc. etc.

20. Pleonastic explanations or turns of expression are frequent, including the union of a compound verb with a simple one: i. 29; vi. 1; xiv. 16, 45; or two compounds from the same stem: i. 35; ii. 15; vi. 33; *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐξ* i. 25, 26 and *ἔξω* xiv. 68; *ἐξήγαγεν ἔξω* viii. 23; *ἐκπορεύειν ἔξω* xi. 19; *τότε ἐν τῇ ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ* ii. 20, etc.; *οὗτος οὕτως* ii. 7; *οἷα τοιαύτη* xiii. 19; *ἧς αὐτῆς* vii. 25; *ἐκ παιδιόθεν* ix. 21; *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν* v. 6, viii. 3, etc.

21. In transitions *εὐθέως* is often employed, or *εὐθύς* which Tischendorf substitutes for it in many cases, i. 18, 21, 31, etc. Luke has the word but eight times and sometimes employs *παραχρῆμα* instead.

22. The sentences are loosely connected by *καὶ* or *πάλιν*, as *καὶ ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, καὶ εἰσῆλθε πάλιν, κ.τ.λ.*

23. Mark interchanges the descriptive imperfect of narrative style for the historical present. The other evangelists use the aorist instead or *ἰδού behold*, i. 12, 40; ii. 3, 5, etc.

24. The following are peculiar to Mark among the synoptists: *ἀββᾶ, ἀγρεύειν, ἀκάνθινος, ἀλαλάζειν, ἄλαλος, ἀλεκτοροφωνία, ἀμφιβάλλειν, ἄμφοδος, ἁμάρτημα, ἀναθεματίζειν, ἄναλος, ἀναπηδᾶν, ἀναστενάζειν, ἀποβάλλειν, ἀπόδημος, ἀποπλανᾶν, ἀποστηγάζειν, ἀσφαλῶς, ἀτιμοῦν, αὐτόματος, ἀφρίζειν, ἀφροσύνη, βαπτισμός, βοανεργής, γναφεύς, δαμάζειν, διαγίνεσθαι, διασπᾶν, λέγειν ἐν τῇ*

διδαχῇ, δύσκολος, δωρεῖσθαι, εἰ in swearing, ἐκθαμβεῖ-θαι, ἐκπερισσῶς, ἔκφοβος, ἐλαύνειν, Ἐλωΐ, Ἑλληνίς, ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι, ἐνειλεῖν, ἔννυχον, ἐνταφιασμός, ἐξάπινα, ἐξαυτῆς, ἐξορύττειν, ἐξουδενεῖν, ἐξουδενοῦν, ἐπιβάλλειν neuter, ἐπιλύειν, ἐπιῤῥάπτειν, ἐπισυντρέχειν, ἐσχάτως, εὔκαιρος, εὐκαίρως, εὐσχήμων, ἐφφαθά, ἠδέως, ἤφιεν (i. 34), θαμβεῖν, θαυμάζειν διά, θερμαίνεσθαι, θυγάτριον, θυρωρός, τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν, κακεῖθεν, κακολογεῖν, κατάβα, καταβαρύνειν (?), καταδιώκειν, κατακόπτειν, κατατιθέναι, κατευλογεῖν (?), κατοίκησις, κεντυρίων, κεφαλαιοῦν, κοῦμι, κράββατος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, κυλίεσθαι, κύπτειν, κωμόπολις, λευκαίνειν, μᾶλλον before a comparative, μεθόρια (?), μελετᾶν, μεγιστᾶνες, μηκύνειν, μισθωτός, μογιλάλος, μορφή, μυρίζειν, νάρδος, νουνεχῶς, ξέστης, ἐξηραμμένος, ὁδοποιεῖν, ὁλοκαύτωμα, ὅσπερ, ὅστις interrogative, ix. 11 (?), οὐά, ὄψιος an adjective, παιδιόθεν, πάμπολυς (?), πανταχόθεν, παραβάλλειν, παραδιδόναι neuter, παρόμοιος, περιτρέχειν, πιστικός, πλοιάριον, πρασιά, προαύλιον, προλαμβάνειν, προμεριμνᾶν, προσάββατον (?), προσεγγίζειν (?), προσκαρτερεῖν, προσκεφάλαιον, προσορμίζεσθαι, προσπορεύεσθαι, προστρέχειν, πρύμνα, πτύειν, πυγμῇ, ῥαββουνί, ῥάπισμα, σκώληξ, σμυρνίζειν, σπᾶσθαι, σπεκουλάτωρ, στασιαστής, στιβάς, στίλβειν, συγκαθῆσθαι, συλλυπεῖσθαι, συμπόσιον, συναναβαίνειν, συνθλίβειν, Συροφοινίκισσα, σύσσημον, συστασιαστής, ταλιθά, ταραχή, τηλαυγῶς, τρίζειν, τρυμαλιά (?), ὑπερηφανία, ὑπερπερισσῶς, ὑπολήνιον, ὑστέρησις, χαλκίον, ὥρα meaning hour of the day, ὠτάριον.[1]

On the whole, the diction of Mark possesses a more Aramaic colouring than Luke's, and approaches nearer that of Matthew; for, while he has forty-five words in common with the latter, he has only eighteen with the former.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

| | |
|---|---|
| i. 2, 3 . . . | Malachi iii. 1; Isaiah xl. 3. |
| ii. 25, 26 . . . | 1 Sam. xxi. 6. |

[1] See Zeller's *Theologische Jahrbücher*, vol. ii. p. 448 *et seq.*

| | |
|---|---|
| iv. 12 | Isaiah vi. 9. |
| vii. 6, 7 | Isaiah xxix. 13. |
| vii. 10 | Exodus xx. 12; xxi. 17. |
| ix. 44 | Isaiah lxvi. 24. |
| x. 6 | Genesis i. 27. |
| x. 7, 8 | Genesis ii. 24. |
| x. 19 | Exodus xx. 12–15. |
| xi. 9 | Psalm cxviii. 25, 26. |
| xi. 17 | Isaiah lvi. 7; Jerem. vii. 11. |
| xii. 10, 11 | Psalm cxviii. 22, 23. |
| xii. 19 | Deut. xxv. 5. |
| xii. 26 | Exodus iii. 6. |
| xii. 29, 30 | Deut. vi. 4. |
| xii. 31 | Levit. xix. 18. |
| xii. 36 | Psalm cx. 1. |
| xiii. 14 | Daniel ix. 27. |
| xiv. 27 | Zechariah xiii. 7. |

General references are in the following :—

| | |
|---|---|
| i. 44 | Levit. xiv. 2. |
| x. 4 | Deut. xxiv. 1. |
| xiii. 24 | Isaiah xiii. 10. |
| xiv. 62 | Daniel vii. 13. |
| xv. 34 | Psalm xxii. 1. |

Seventeen of these quotations are common to Matthew and Mark, ten of them agreeing verbally. Four differ but little, viz. Mark vii. 10=Matthew xv. 4; Mark x. 7, 8=Matthew xix. 5; Mark xii. 29, 30=Matthew xxii. 37; Mark xv. 34=Matthew xxvii. 46. Three differ considerably: Mark iv. 12=Matthew xiii. 14, 15; Mark x. 19=Matthew xix. 18, 19; Mark xii. 19=Matthew xxii. 24. The evangelist's citations are all context ones, to speak after the rule of Bleek; i.e. they are not made by himself, but form portions of his narrative, and occur either in Christ's words or the words of persons addressing him. They are therefore from the LXX. Chapter i. 2 is from the Hebrew, which corresponds to Bleek's canon. But i. 3 is from the Greek, which is against it. There is a difficulty in the quotation or quotations in i. 2, 3, which prevents the critic from speaking confidently, because the one is from Mal. iii. 1, though introduced by 'written in Isaiah the

prophet ;' the other from Isaiah xl. 3. But the former citation is also in Matthew xi. 10 and Luke vii. 27, whence Mark may have taken it, inserting 'the prophet Isaiah' by mistake. As to the interpretation, we do not approve of Lachmann's long parenthesis from *as it is written* to *his paths* inclusive, because it is awkward to say that 'John was the beginning of the gospel.' The first verse is an independent sentence, meaning 'the beginning of the gospel history of Jesus Christ.'

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

00067919

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018